THE Nation

AMERICA'S LEADING LIBERAL WEEKLY SINCE 1865

VOLUME 150 NEW YORK · SATURDAY · MARCH 2, 1940 NUMBER 9

The Shape of Things

IN THE KARELIAN ISTHMUS THE RUSSIAN army continues to advance, although slowly and at heavy cost. The Finns have abandoned the fortified Koivisto Islands, and Viipuri is admittedly in grave danger. But even if that key position is lost, strong lines of defense remain. However, with the limited man power at its command the Finnish army is increasingly in need of more substantial reinforcement than the trickle of foreign volunteers can provide. In Sweden agitation for open intervention continues, but majority opinion appears to support the government's determination to remain neutral. War with Russia, it is argued, would probably mean less rather than more assistance for Finland, since it would almost certainly lead to German invasion and the mobilization of all resources for home defense. Allied intervention would no doubt follow, and southern Scandinavia would then become a major battlefield of the greater war. No one can deny the basis of reality on which this forecast rests, but as long as Sweden and Norway seek to limit their risks in this way, large-scale assistance from the west is blocked. Few suitable volunteers seem to have been obtained by the opening of recruitment in London, but the government has sent a good deal of material to Finland, including 144 planes.

✶

A BREACH BETWEEN THE U. S. S. R. AND THE Allies is becoming increasingly probable even if the Scandinavian states continue on their present course. Extension of the British naval patrols to Arctic waters and activities in the Near East may be taken as preparatory moves, but the final decision is yet to be made. Public opinion in Britain seems to be adverse to war with Russia, partly because it doubts the wisdom of tackling a new enemy at this time, partly because of distrust of the government's motives. But opinion may change if the Red Army continues to advance, for the dangers of a Russo-German hegemony over Scandinavia will become more obvious. In terms of grand strategy, the question to be decided by the Allied governments is whether the additional weight of Russia in the ranks of the enemy would be counterbalanced by the chance of opening up a flank against Germany. Extension of the war would make possible a tightening of the blockade by stopping such loopholes as Murmansk and Vladivostock. But these are of minor importance, and on the other side of the ledger would be the reinforcement of the counter-blockade by the Russian submarine fleet. A weightier consideration is the possibility of a campaign in the Near East. This assumes Turkish willingness to participate in action against Russia, and, in fact, the preparations of the government and the tone of its press suggest that little remains of the former friendship between Ankara and Moscow. Geographical factors render an invasion of the Caucasus a formidable undertaking, but an Allied-Turkish fleet could probably control the Black Sea while aerial action might destroy the Baku oil fields, thus cutting off one of the chief sources of oil for both Germany and Russia. The effects of such a stroke would be so far-reaching that the Allies may decide that the game is worth the candle.

✶

WHY BRITAIN FAILED TO OBTAIN A PACT with Moscow is still an unanswered question, although a White Paper was promised by London weeks ago. On February 21 Richard Austen Butler, Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs, declared in the House of Commons that he was still unable to name a date for publication of the documents and seemed to hint that the French government might be the obstacle. One suspects that neither party to these negotiations is anxious to publish the documents involved because both were dickering behind the scenes with Berlin at the same time. Raymond Daniell, in a New York *Times* dispatch from London on February 7, put forward an explanation of the repeated postponement of the British White Paper on negotiations with Russia which is worth noting. The document was scheduled for publication nearly a month ago. Daniell wrote, "It can be said authoritatively"—and the censor passed the remark—that the postponement is not due to fear that the White Paper might "precipitate a crisis in Anglo-Russian relations." "The explanation," he went on, "lies rather in the belated realization that the document as originally prepared failed to make out as good a case against the Soviet government as the compilators planned, and that it

Published weekly and copyright, 1940, in the U. S. A. by The Nation, Inc., 55 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. Entered as second-class matter December 13, 1897, at the Post Office of New York, N. Y. under the act of March 3, 1897.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

might be more embarrassing to Britain's allies than to anyone else, especially after Soviet casuists and apologists had finished talking about it." In the last war the various Blue Books, White Papers, Yellow Books, and the like on both sides were liberally falsified. Is the British case too weak to stand exposure? Or is the reference to Britain's allies a hint that the French and Poles had as much to do with the breakdown of negotiations as Moscow?

*

THE ENTHRONEMENT OF THE NEW DALAI Lama at Lhasa, Tibet, is an event of great religious and political significance in that far-off land. For nearly a generation Tibet has been, for all practical purposes, a British colony. British control was exercised through the clique which dominated the late Dalai Lama and finally succeeded in expelling his chief ecclesiastical rival, the Panchan Lama. In recent months, as the Chinese government has shifted its base to the west, Chinese influence in Tibet has grown. The new Lama seems to have been the choice of a group which is far more pro-Chinese than the previous ruling clique. There is no evidence, however, that the British have suffered a complete defeat. It is probable that in the three-cornered struggle of Britain, the Soviet Union, and Japan for control of Central Asia, Tibet will remain under British suzerainty.

*

HOPE FOR AN EMBARGO AGAINST JAPAN HAS grown even dimmer this past week as a result of the failure of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to take any action on the measures before it. Senator Pittman, chairman of the committee and author of one of the embargo resolutions, has indicated that as far as he is concerned the committee has finished its work for this session of Congress. The elimination of the million-dollar item for harbor improvements at Guam from the naval-appropriation bill suggests that the House, like the Senate, is disinclined to take any action at this time that might antagonize Japan. To a certain extent this is reflection of isolationist sentiment. But isolationist sentiment has never wholly dominated Congress, and its existence cannot account for the growing tenderness for Japan which has been apparent in recent weeks. There is ground for suspicion that the shift in Congress is a reflection of the more basic change in Britain's policy toward Japan. For it can no longer be doubted that London is seeking a compromise with Tokyo on whatever terms are possible, and that it would like to see the United States take similar action. To the uninitiated it may seem odd that the United States should sacrifice its own interests to please Mr. Chamberlain, but just two years ago the United States did exactly this in refusing to lift the embargo on war supplies to Republican Spain.

JOHN W. HANES IS TO BE COMMENDED FOR withdrawing his name from the list of possible appointees as trustee in the Associated Gas and Electric bankruptcy. Jerome Frank, chairman of the SEC, in a letter to Senator Norris admitted that Hanes had been recommended for the trusteeship by Lazard Frères and by officials of the Guaranty Trust, Bankers' Trust, and Chase National. He was also favored by Roger Whiteford, according to Frank's letter, and Whiteford himself was made president of A. G. and E. "at the instance of the sisters and a brother-in-law of Mr. Hopson." One wonders why these facts were not brought to the attention of the court before Senator Norris wrote his first letter of protest to Frank, or why the latter did not make them public earlier. It is true, as the chairman and a majority of the SEC contend, that these facts "do not constitute a statutory disqualification," but to rest on that is to beg the question. Commissioner Eicher, in charge of the commission's Chandler Act division, took a sounder position when he declared in a minority opinion that "the exercise of a sound discretion applied to the available facts requires a finding of disqualification." The SEC seems to us to be interpreting its own powers too narrowly in a case where the greatest vigilance is required to protect a mass of small investors, and we are not yet convinced that this was not a situation in which the SEC should itself act as trustee. Secretary Morgenthau and Attorney General Jackson still think so.

*

THE NEED FOR KEEPING THE REGULATORY agencies of the federal government free from interference either by the President or the courts is stressed in a report just issued by the Brookings Institution. These conclusions are especially pertinent since the Senate is soon to consider the Logan-Walter bill, which would place such agencies as the National Labor Relations Board or the Securities Exchange Commission at the mercy of the courts. Brookings's opposition to the Logan-Walter bill is based on the fact that the implementation of statutes is an integral part of the legislative process and as such should not, under the constitutional separation of powers, be subject to judicial intervention. The proposed establishment of inter-agency boards is also attacked as inconsistent with the needs of day-to-day administration. Experience has amply demonstrated the wisdom of the Brookings conclusions. At one time or another the work of practically all the regulatory agencies has been gravely handicapped by adverse judicial decisions, and thereby the express intent of Congress has been controverted. Although the courts have the duty of safeguarding individuals against arbitrary or high-handed administration of the law, Congress alone should have the power to revise the rules and regulations established by the agencies which it creates.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MORE THAN ONCE FATHER COUGHLIN HAS stolen his text from other people's mouths—without benefit of quotation marks. His most common and willing victim has been Dr. Goebbels. But recently Coughlin has gone in for a new form of plagiarism: he puts quotation marks around utterances which are completely and exclusively his own, and attributes them to some scholar more reputable than Charles Coughlin. The newest example of this technique appears in Coughlin's current crusade, which is designed to show, in the most impeccably academic fashion, that Jews were responsible for the Civil War in America. In the first of a series of articles which will "prove" this point, Coughlin's *Social Justice* pretends to quote from a book by John Reeves called "The Rothschilds, the Financial Rulers of Nations," published in 1887. The quotation is of a speech said to have been made by Disraeli at the time of the marriage of Lionel Rothschild's daughter to James Rothschild's son. According to *Social Justice,* the passage in Reeves read: "Disraeli is reported to have said: 'Under this roof are the heads of the family of Rothschild—a name famous in every capital of Europe and every division of the globe. If you like we shall divide the United States into two parts, one for you, James, and one for you, Lionel. Napoleon will do exactly and all that I advise him.'" But if you look on page 228 of the Reeves book you discover a strikingly different passage: "In the course of his speech he [Disraeli] made a remark worth reproducing: 'Under this roof are the heads of the name and family of Rothschild—a name famous in every capital in Europe and every division of the globe—a family not more regarded for its riches than esteemed for its honor, virtues, integrity, and public spirit.'"

*

LAST YEAR'S RISE IN NATIONAL INCOME from $64,000,000,000 to $68,500,000,000 should provide excellent grist for the 1940 Democratic campaign mill. For as prices were approximately the same as in the previous year, the gain is a real one and reflects a substantial improvement in the American people's standard of living. Nor can the improvement be attributed solely to the war. The upturn in business began in early summer and continued unchecked throughout the remainder of the year. What is not generally realized is that the 1939 national income of $68,500,000,000 at the present price level is substantially the same as the record $81,000,000,000 income of 1929. The fact that the population has increased in the interval means, of course, that the per capita income is still well under the 1929 level. But another gain comparable to the one achieved last year would put the country at least abreast of 1929. Comparisons with 1932 are far more encouraging. Republican campaign speakers may be expected to ignore the basic indices of our national well-being.

TWO SERIOUS GAPS IN OUR SOCIAL-SECURITY legislation would be filled by adoption of the bills about to be introduced by Senator Wagner providing voluntary annuities for persons not now covered by old-age insurance and benefits for total disability before the age of sixty-five. Despite the improvements made through last year's amendments to the Social Security Act, approximately one-third of all workers are not now protected by old-age insurance. Although many individuals, such as the self-employed, cannot easily be included in a compulsory system, there is no reason why they should be denied the protection afforded to the majority. Voluntary old-age insurance has long been successfully provided in some European countries, and could readily be incorporated in our present system. Even more urgent is the need for some provision for the disabled. Investigations, both here and abroad, have shown that nearly half of all workers become disabled by sickness, accident, or premature old age before reaching sixty-five. This group is obviously in greater need of benefits than those who reach sixty-five without serious physical impairment. Practically all other countries provide disability benefits as an integral part of old-age insurance. It is time the United States caught up with Europe in this respect.

*

IN FRAMING HIS PROPOSAL FOR A UNITED States Mediation Board, Senator Wagner has carefully avoided the dangers common to most measures of this sort. The board he plans would be established in the Department of Labor to extend the conciliation service of that department. But its powers would be sharply defined. Specifically the plan eliminates any idea of "compulsory mediation" or of a fixed "waiting period" in which claims would be weighed. Nor would the board have authority to impose penalties or issue subpoenas. The processes of mediation, in other words, would be entirely voluntary. Within these boundaries such an agency would perform a real service. Its most valuable contributions would be in those areas of industrial conflict not covered by the National Labor Relations Act—conflict over hours, working conditions, and other matters which in many cases are susceptible of mediation. If there is any danger at all in this proposal, it is that it may become identified with other and far less liberal measures now pending in Washington; at least one bill already introduced proposes a system of compulsory mediation in every intrastate industry. The sanction for such projects is drawn from the Railway Labor Act, but in less well-organized industries the "waiting period" decreed by this act could be disastrous to union action. Senator Wagner has made clear his own lack of sympathy with such schemes—which seem to be designed primarily to emasculate the labor-relations act which bears his name.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Our Lawless G-Men

THE secret police of totalitarian countries, whether Communist, Fascist, or Nazi, need refer to no statute books in order to investigate, arrest, or imprison. They, and not the law, decide what constitutes a crime. Our G-men, like those other G-men of the Gestapo and GPU, are beginning to act on similar principles. Our evidence for this statement comes from J. Edgar Hoover himself. His testimony last November and again in January before the House Appropriations Committee shows that the Federal Bureau of Investigation is engaging in activities for which it has no legal authorization. We believe it the Attorney General's duty to investigate and forbid the extra-legal activities of the FBI.

In September, 1939, the FBI organized a "General Intelligence Division," and when Hoover appeared before the House Appropriations Committee to ask a supplemental appropriation in November, he described the activities of this division. He said it had "compiled extensive indices of individuals, groups, and organizations engaged in these subversive activities, in espionage activities, or any activities that are possibly detrimental to the internal security of the United States." The detection of espionage is part of the bureau's duty, but what does Hoover mean by "subversive activities" and "any activities that are possibly detrimental to the internal security of the United States"? Either category can be as broad as the head of the FBI chooses to make it, and neither is made a subject for inquiry by any federal law. What is the purpose of these "extensive indices"? They have been arranged "not only alphabetically," Hoover explained, "but also geographically, so that at any time, should we enter into the conflict abroad, we would be able to go into any of these communities and identify individuals or groups who might be a source of grave danger to the security of this country. These indexes will be extremely important and valuable in grave emergency." That is, lists of persons he considers dangerous have been compiled by J. Edgar Hoover for a mass roundup in the event of war or "grave emergency." No such compilation is authorized by law. Is Hoover to act as an American Himmler?

Hoover's notions of what constitutes the "subversive" are sufficiently well known. They parallel the views of his greatest booster, William Randolph Hearst, and it is sufficient to say that they are broad enough to include among the "enemies to society" advocates of as mild a reform as parole. The words quoted are from Hoover's address in July, 1935, before the International Association of Chiefs of Police. Hoover's methods of operation were dramatically demonstrated the other day in Detroit when he chose five o'clock in the morning as the hour to rouse twelve reputable citizens of Detroit from their beds and bring them into court in chains on charges the Attorney General several days later dismissed. The early-morning raid, as a means of striking terror into the victims, is part of the technique of every totalitarian secret-police agency. Some idea of the breadth of Hoover's ambitions may be obtained from the release he sent out last September suggesting that local authorities throughout the country, in granting permits for public meetings, notify the FBI of such meetings in advance. In September, Hoover testified, he wrote to many persons and organizations, including "banks, business houses, railroads," asking for their cooperation in the "general intelligence" work. The definition of "subversive" held by some bankers, business men, and railroad executives is apt to be a broad one, sometimes broad enough to take in the whole of the New Deal from Mr. Roosevelt down. Later in the same month Hoover issued a statement which invited the cooperation of citizens everywhere in "ridding America of those who desire to undermine the federal government."

This is not the country's first experience with either a General Intelligence Division or J. Edgar Hoover. Hoover was head of the General Intelligence Division from 1919 to 1924, when it was abolished by Harlan F. Stone, now a justice of the United States Supreme Court, when he became Attorney General. William J. Burns was then head of the FBI. The division played a part, according to Felix Frankfurter, in framing Sacco and Vanzetti. It compiled biographies, according to the Attorney General's report in 1920, "of all authors, publishers, editors, etc., showing any connection with an ultra-radical body or movement." The ramifications of the FBI's "general intelligence" work were protested by the American Civil Liberties Union in a famous report of May, 1924, entitled "The Nation-wide Spy System Centering in the Department of Justice." According to an article by Ray Tucker in *Collier's* for August 19, 1933, former President Hoover was among the dangerous radicals shadowed by the FBI in that period, and "at one time or another the bureau's files have contained reports on such prominent Americans as Justice Stone, the late Senator Thomas, Senator Wheeler, Senator Borah, Dean Roscoe Pound, Professor Felix Frankfurter, Professor Zechariah Chaffee, Jr., Frank P. Walsh, and John L. Lewis."

The FBI has now been granted $10,000,000 for the next fiscal year, much of it to revive illegal practices of the kind that marked its conduct during the days of A. Mitchell Palmer and William J. Burns. That amount is roughly fifteen times as great as the bureau's appropriation in the year we entered the war, 1917. Congress has failed in its duty by voting that $10,000,000 as a routine matter, consenting by silence to the continuation of activities totally at variance with American principles of government. The Attorney General must now

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

take steps to confine the FBI to its statutory job. That job is not to be a combination of Dick Tracy and Mrs. Dilling.

Trade Agreements Upheld

THE action of the House in deciding, by a vote of 216 to 168, to extend the Trade Agreements Act three more years would be wholly gratifying if it had not been taken on what appears to be almost entirely partisan grounds. While a few individuals broke party ranks and voted according to conviction, an overwhelming majority of Representatives divided strictly along party lines with apparent indifference to the basic issues of the controversy. From one point of view this is fully understandable. For many decades the tariff was the main, if not the only, issue which clearly divided the Republican from the Democratic Party. The Hull trade program is directly in line with the historic tariff policy of the Democratic Party, and therefore has been bitterly opposed by the Republicans.

This may explain but it does not justify such an overwhelmingly partisan vote on a matter of deep public concern. There is no such clear-cut division of interests among the rank and file of men and women who vote the Democratic or Republican tickets. It is true that most persons who live in the South would naturally, in view of the section's dependence on exports, be in the camp of the supporters of the Hull trade policy. And it happens that the South's Representatives in Congress are all Democrats. A similar identity of interest and party inspired New York City's Democratic Congressmen, for New York, as the country's chief port, stands to benefit substantially from an increase in foreign trade.

But on what basis, economic or logical, can the bulk of the Republican vote be justified? The assertion that the Hull trade program is ruinous to agriculture represents, as we have repeatedly shown in these pages, so gross a falsification of the facts that it is to be doubted whether it is believed even by Republican leaders. Similarly, it would be difficult to find any industry of importance which has been materially injured by the trade agreements. If such an industry existed, we should be deluged with "statistics" showing how the program was destroying American industry. On the other hand, several important industries have been materially aided by the trade pacts. In some cases these industries have been virtually unheard in Washington because the Representatives from the states in which they are located happened to be Republicans. Mr. Vandenberg, for example, as the senior Senator from Michigan, is acting in a manner that is fundamentally antagonistic to the best interests of the automobile industry when he attacks the Hull program.

Passage of the bill, under the circumstances, was a foregone conclusion. The crucial vote was not on the bill itself but on the amendment introduced by Representative Crowther of New York to make all agreements contingent on approval by both houses of Congress. Adoption of such a provision, or the alternative proposal of Representative Coffee of Nebraska requiring Senate ratification, would have scuttled the entire program. It would have had the effect of reopening the whole question of specific tariff rates every time an agreement came up for ratification. History has shown that the result would be an orgy of log-rolling and vote-trading, with little, if any, progress in the direction of stimulating foreign trade. Equally indefensible was the amendment offered by Representative Disney of Oklahoma, which would have forbidden the American negotiators to make reductions in the excise duties recently applied on imports of copper, oil, lumber, coal, and vegetable oils. These "excise duties" are clearly tariff duties masquerading under another name, and very bad duties at that.

The bill for the extension of the Hull program now goes to the Senate, where it is believed that the Administration has sufficient votes to force its adoption in substantially its present form. Here party lines are not quite so strong, and it is to be hoped that the debate will be on a higher level than that in the House. But if we are to judge by some of the statements already issued by leading Senators, the prospects for an enlightened discussion are none too bright.

Can Britain Afford Chamberlain?

LAST WEEK, in a purely working-class London constituency, a district of docks and factories, an official Labor Party candidate who supported the war was elected to Parliament with 14,343 votes. Opposing him was Harry Pollitt, one of the ablest and most popular Communist leaders, and a member of Mosley's Fascist Party, both of whom denounced the "imperialist" war. They polled 966 and 151 votes, respectively.

The result of this by-election is a clear indication that the defeatist propaganda of the Communist Party is making little headway among the British working classes despite the freedom accorded to it. But as Ernest Davies points out in an article on page 302, the fact that the British Labor Party is supporting the war does not mean that it is satisfied with the Chamberlain government. On the contrary, the policies pursued by the government both at home and abroad are causing increasing restiveness.

The progressive elements in Britain, as represented by the Labor movement, and the conservative upper classes, from whose ranks the government is wholly recruited, seek the defeat of Nazism from quite different motives.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Long ago the Labor movement, apart from a small pacifist section, realized that Hitler must be stopped if any democracy was to survive in Europe. Mr. Chamberlain's supporters, on the other hand, closed their eyes to the significance of National Socialism. They were dominated by a dread of war because they believed—and with reason—that its economic consequences would be ruinous to the social system on which their power and security rested. Hence they continued to pursue appeasement up to the moment that it became clear, even to them, that Hitler, so far from being a bulwark against bolshevism, represented a revolutionary movement which unless halted would sweep away not only British democracy but the British Empire as well. Once Mr. Chamberlain and his followers had firmly grasped this fact there was little reason to fear another Munich. But since their primary purpose in seeking the defeat of Hitler is to safeguard their economic security, their conduct of the war against him is conditioned by their desire to save as much from the wreck as possible. This is made clear by the direction of those "incitements to treason" of which Raymond Swing wrote in *The Nation's* anniversary number. These appeals to Germans to throw off the Hitler yoke are intended to reach the reactionary rather than the democratic elements inside the Reich. They look toward the reestablishment of a respectable capitalist society on a pre-1914 rather than a pre-Hitler model and, with this in view, patronize the right-wing exiles, the monarchists, the Austrian clericals, the industrialists, and tend to ignore the democrats and the socialists.

The same wish to turn back the clock inspires the domestic policy of the Chamberlain government. Ernest Davies describes the results of its attempts to construct a war economy with a minimum of disturbance and inconvenience to private enterprise. Industry has been organized on a kind of NRA plan largely under the control of its own leaders. Taxes have been steeply increased, but the fact that capital gains are not subject to any levy in Britain leaves a wide loophole for wealthy speculators. Again excess profits are being taxed but only to the extent of 60 per cent. With the war-time powers over production possessed by the government there is no need for it to provide additional incentives to entrepreneurs, and no reason why it should not take all excess profits. A further example of its tenderness toward capitalist interests is provided by the recent agreement with the British railroads, which appears to guarantee for the duration of the war a net income considerably above their earnings in recent years.

Under these circumstances it is hardly surprising that the workers should kick when told that in order to avoid inflation their wages must be kept down despite a steep rise in the cost of living. There is no doubt that prevention of inflation is a wise policy, but with a large proportion of British workers near the subsistence level, it would appear that a tighter hand on prices is the first essential. This means, however, greater interference with private enterprise and a much wider system of rationing so that the well-to-do cannot bid up the prices of scarce necessities.

Add to the class-conscious timidity of the Chamberlain government in tackling the problem of war economy its penchant for old party hacks in responsible positions, its unwillingness to prove the good faith of its democratic protestations by meeting the claims of India, and its appalling record in resisting totalitarian aggressions, and the sum total explains the distrust of a large section of the British people. Under such leadership the kind of unity necessary for a fully effective British war effort can hardly be developed, and the question arises: can Britain afford to retain Mr. Chamberlain? As the conflict moves into a more active stage, as it becomes more and more a struggle for national existence, with the fate of Poland the penalty for defeat, that question will demand an answer.

CONTENTS

THE SHAPE OF THINGS 293
EDITORIALS:
OUR LAWLESS G-MEN 296
TRADE AGREEMENTS UPHELD 297
CAN BRITAIN AFFORD CHAMBERLAIN? 297
MEN WHO WOULD BE PRESIDENT
I. JOHN NANCE GARNER by Allan A. Michie 299
LABOR DISTRUSTS CHAMBERLAIN by Ernest Davies 302
MARXISM RECONSIDERED—III by Lewis Corey 305
A LINCOLN NOBODY KNEW by I. F. Stone 307
EVERYBODY'S BUSINESS by Keith Hutchison 308
IN THE WIND 309
ISSUES AND MEN by Oswald Garrison Villard 310
BOOKS AND THE ARTS:
FAITH, HOPE, AND CLARITY by Margaret Marshall 311
MR. MENCKEN'S CRANFORD by Morton Dauwen Zabel 312
PORTRAIT OF HITLER by Franz Hoellering 313
BUSINESS AND GOVERNMENT by Maxwell S. Stewart 314
COUSIN FROM AUSTRALIA by Jacques Barzun 315
SHORTER NOTICES 315
DRAMA: COULD YOU AND I CONSPIRE by Joseph Wood Krutch 316
MUSIC by B. H. Haggin 317

Editor and Publisher
FREDA KIRCHWEY

Managing Editor ROBERT BENDINER
Literary Editor MARGARET MARSHALL

Associate Editors
KEITH HUTCHISON MAXWELL S. STEWART I. F. STONE
Assistant Editor
JAMES WECHSLER
Dramatic Critic
JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH

Business Manager and Director of Circulation
HUGO VAN ARX
Advertising Manager
MURIEL GRAY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Men Who Would Be President

I. JOHN NANCE GARNER

BY ALLAN A. MICHIE

SIX months ago Vice-President Garner's chance of shortening his title by one word seemed a good deal brighter than it is today. But the visible slump in his stock has not darkened the Raleigh Hotel in Washington, where John Nance Garner has his campaign headquarters. "Garner is in the race to win, regardless of whether there are any other candidates" is the official pronouncement at the Raleigh.

Presiding at headquarters is affable, glad-handing Roy Miller, a Garnerite of many years' standing, with a long and unenviable record as lobbyist for the Texas Gulf Sulphur Company. It is one of Miller's functions to tell all comers of the career of Cactus Jack, the cattle-country politician, of his climb from an obscure country law office to a position of financial importance in Texas—as banker, mortgage-holder, and landowner—and finally to the status of the country's "foremost Presidential candidate." His old age is laughed at—"Jack Garner has the mental and physical vigor of a man twenty years his junior"—and his liking for hunting and fishing, baseball, poker, and neat whiskey is cited as evidence of a homely Americanism designed to withstand the pressures of alien isms. The log-cabin birthplace, the self-education, the simple virtues and simple vices of the rugged individual are all part of the Garner legend which time, more recently aided by smart press agents, has created.

Garner had to be born in a log cabin, since there were few other types of dwelling in Texas when he came into the world on November 22, 1868, at Blossom Prairie, a hamlet in Red River County. He had a sickly childhood, which periodically interrupted his early education, but he was able to achieve a youthful reputation as the crack shortstop for the Coon Soup Hollow baseball nine. Unable to get a higher education at Nashville's Vanderbilt University because of failing eyesight, he came back to the Texas plains and punched cattle in an effort to regain his health, but ultimately abandoned this occupation in favor of reading Blackstone in a small law office in Clarksville, county seat of Red River County. Admitted to the bar, he received an offer of a partnership in Uvalde, at that time a dusty, unpainted little village of 2,000 inhabitants, where he has maintained a residence ever since. The partnership prospered. Garner, whose tight-fistedness is legend in Washington, drove hard bargains and made shrewd deals. Today he owns Uvalde's main bank, holds mortgages on half the homes in the little town, and has acquired vast farming, ranching, and pecan-growing lands either through purchase or foreclosure.

The parsimonious young lawyer had two extravagances—poker and whiskey—but he has done well with both. When a righteous young woman by the name of Ettie Rheiner opposed Garner's appointment as judge of Uvalde County on the ground that poker playing made him a first cousin of the devil, Garner married her. She has served as his secretary ever since. The Garner legend still has the Vice-President playing poker for huge stakes. Actually, Garner has not played cards for money, except when off on a rare Congressional trip, for eighteen years. Mrs. Garner made him stop because the size of the stakes he collected often made poor losers into political enemies.

Convivial nights with local political bosses gave Garner his start. Texas fortunes in those days were founded on cattle, and the ranchers needed politicians in the right places to safeguard the interests of their feudal domains. Big Jim Wells, the boss of south Texas, was the first to cotton to Jack Garner. He had the young lawyer elected to the state legislature to keep one eye on the Wells estate. Four years later Garner moved upward. The census at the turn of the century entitled Texas to another Congressional district, and Boss Wells, anxious to have another representative in Washington, wanted the new district carved out of south Texas. Garner was made chairman of the committee to redistrict the state. The new district, it turned out, was drawn around the region where his own strength was greatest. His colleagues were furious, but Wells, Archie Parr, czar of Duval County, and the owners of the King ranch, still the largest cattle empire in the world, silenced the opposition. In 1902 Garner was duly elected to a seat in Washington, where he has remained ever since.

Unlike the majority of Southern politicians, Garner never had to fight for reelection. Every two years the political bosses in the Fifteenth Congressional District herded the illiterate Mexican Americans to the polls and had them vote in blocks. Returns from some Garner-represented counties read like those turned in by Boss Crump in Memphis. Archie Parr, Garner's old crony, who once ruled Duval County but has now outlived his political usefulness, used to say that since people were sheep anyway, he voted sheep too. With this powerful

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

machine behind him Garner didn't have to bother with campaign promises, or even constructive legislation. A few dips into the pork barrel each term repaid the bosses back home. Cactus Jack, a nickname he acquired when he once sought to make the cactus the official flower of the Lone Star State, had ample time to cultivate his natural talents for making friends who could stand him in good political stead.

It is incredible that a politician with Garner's record—or lack of record—should be seriously considered as a Presidential candidate. His public career has been amazingly barren of achievement: despite thirty years of service in Congress his name does not appear on one major piece of legislation. He attained his position, first as Speaker of the House, then as Vice-President, through the unavoidable process of seniority. "The only way to get anywhere in Congress is to stay there and let seniority take its course," is Garner's advice to freshmen Texas Representatives, and Garner has followed it to the letter. He scarcely opened his mouth during his first eight years in the House, and when he did, it was usually to engage in meaningless, futile attacks on Republican tariff policies.

Garner is far from a liberal, but the well-defined conservative label doesn't fit him either. In fact, it is doubtful whether he understands the meaning of the terms. Never a deep thinker, Garner, quite naturally, has the outlook of a small-town conservative banker, but his whole political philosophy is based on expediency. In one indiscreet outburst he admitted: "I have always done what I thought best for my country, never varying unless I was advised that two-thirds of the Democrats were for a bill, and then I voted for it." The Garner policy of taking the course that was most profitable is nowhere more glaringly revealed than in the field of foreign affairs. Although an isolationist by nature if not by conviction during his early years in Congress, Garner went down the line for Woodrow Wilson and willingly ran for two terms alongside Franklin Roosevelt, two of the most international-minded of American Presidents. In April, 1917, Garner voted for the war resolution, and while America was in the war served as liaison man between Wilson and Capitol Hill, since the President was on bad terms with Speaker Champ Clark and Claude Kitchen, chairman of the influential Ways and Means Committee. Garner balked, however, when it came to lending money to the Allies, and it was only his intimate connection with Wilson that made him hold his tongue against them in public. Today, Washington observers believe, the Vice-President personally favors lending money to Finland. Politically, however, such a course would put him in direct agreement with President Roosevelt and might also cost him support among the more ardent isolationists. In view of these considerations, Garner has allowed his favorite Washington correspondents to hint that "the V.P. is ag'in" lending money to the Finns.

In 1924 Garner earned the fleeting newspaper reputation of a "radical" when he unleashed a characteristic Western attack on a particularly foul tax-reduction bill which Andrew Mellon and Wall Street sponsored. In 1931 he went off in the other direction. W. R. Hearst was anxious to see a nation-wide sales tax enacted, and Garner got behind a bill for a federal sales levy. The tax bill was defeated, but only after a heroic fight by the progressive bloc. Whereupon Garner did an about-face and sponsored a gigantic $2,500,000,000 pump-priming relief bill—largely because Hoover refused to use large-scale spending methods to combat the depression. Representative LaGuardia of New York and Senator Bob La Follette of Wisconsin had long urged relief spending, but Garner's ideas of governmental spending were quite different. He advocated enough new post offices so that every Democratic member of the Congress could claim one; he threw in highways, flood-control projects, and $100,000,000 for outright grants to the states for unemployment relief, plus the provision to print a billion dollars of paper money if necessary. Garner, figure-head leader of the economy bloc of the past few years, doesn't like to be reminded of his spending proposals, which became known as "Garner's pork-barrel triplets." One of the three bills passed the House and Senate, but Hoover vetoed it, and the others died before passage. When spending failed, Garner once again turned to Hearst. The publisher did not forget Garner's services in the sales-tax campaign. On January 11, 1932, he told the country over a national hook-up that Jack Garner should be the next President of the United States.

Garner is not an out-in-the-open fighter, and his attacks on the C. I. O. and the rights of labor, in particular, have always been confined to the cloakrooms. Back in 1926, however, Congressman Garner went on record to defend the exploitation of the Mexican Americans who worked the fields of south Texas. There were rumors in Washington that quota restrictions would be applied on the immigration of Mexicans, and Cactus Jack scurried before the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization to testify. Defending the virtues of cheap Mexican labor, Garner explained: "They do not cause any trouble unless they stay a long time and become Americanized. They are a very docile people. They can be imposed upon. The sheriff can go out and make them do anything. That is the way they are."

When the conservative-controlled first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress was gaveled into history a year ago, Garner's political fortunes were at their peak. As leader of the conservative Democratic and Republican coalition, and as the willing symbol of anti-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Roosevelt sentiment in Congress and throughout the country, the seventy-one-year-old Vice-President was a serious Presidential candidate, with a nation-wide poll popularity equal to or better than that of Taft, Hull, Dewey, Farley, or Vandenberg. Congressional "beat Roosevelt" maneuvers were worked out in the privacy of his offices, and Senators Pat Harrison of Mississippi and Jimmy Byrnes of South Carolina, master-strategists of the conservative bloc, called daily at the V. P.'s sanctuary to "strike a blow for liberty" with three fingers of Bourbon.

In recent months the play and the players have changed rapidly, and Garner is now given far less prominent billing in the coming Democratic drama. Regardless of what the little Texan's campaign managers say, the early Garner-for-President boom was a simple "stop Roosevelt" movement as far as its conservative Democratic backers were concerned, and its strength came from the reasonable assumption that President Roosevelt would remain outspokenly liberal up to and through the 1940 election. But Garner and his backers have been reminded during recent months that their chief at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue is also a pretty shrewd politician. The new Roosevelt strategy of appeasing the conservative Democrats in the interest of "party unity" has cut some of the ground from under Garner, and the quiet campaign to "draft" Secretary of State Cordell Hull, who is conservative enough to satisfy the right wing of the party, hasn't helped the Garner candidacy.

Garner is acutely aware of his altered position. When I interviewed him in his Senate office, he perched like a puzzled owl behind his desk and testily refused to comment on or off the record on any subject, even the recent death of Senator Borah. His handy supply of liquor, which broke the ice for many a visiting newspaperman in the old days, remained locked in the cupboard. The Vice-President is extremely touchy on his Presidential candidacy. As soon as I mentioned "Democratic Presidential possibilities," I was shown the door. What irritates Garner most is that his offices are no longer the scene of strategy-mapping conferences where Roosevelt-sponsored legislation is crippled before it reaches the floor of the Senate or House. Byrnes and Harrison, who were among the first to encourage Garner to make himself "available" for the Presidency, still drop in to pass the time of day, but they now have almost daily conferences at the White House, and Jimmy Byrnes, an on-again, off-again Roosevelt man since 1936, is once more the President's wheelhorse in the Senate. To rejuvenate the Garner candidacy Roosevelt would have to renounce his policy of appeasement and declare himself a candidate for a third term on a New Deal program or openly commit himself to the choice of a liberal, such as Attorney General Robert H. Jackson, likewise on a New Deal platform.

If, for purposes of speculation, it is conceded that Garner could get the Democratic nomination, what are his chances of election? Washington observers believe they are almost non-existent. Any Republican, they contend, except perhaps Herbert Hoover, could defeat Garner, for if the people honestly want a conservative candidate, they will turn to the party with traditionally conservative candidates. The Democrats, these observers point out, have never won with a conservative.

What the Vice-President would do in the White House in the remote eventuality that he were elected must remain, for the present, a matter of speculation. He has no program. He has come a long way by keeping his mouth closed, and he is not going to ruin his slim chance of nomination by opening it now. To all questions concerning his views on neutrality, relief, housing, civil rights, labor, or anything else he has one answer: "I have no opinion."

Vice-President Garner

Nevertheless, some generalizations on a Garner Administration are permissible in the light of his record. The Dies committee, for example, would most certainly be retained. Garner is still behind Dies, but just as quietly as when he first encouraged the Bad Boy from Orange to begin his investigations. Majority Leader Sam Rayburn, Garner's man in the House, has been instrumental in getting Congressional support for Dies. As a politician who has been maintained in office by the votes of a boss-ridden electorate, Garner has been untroubled by the denial of constitutional rights. In the words of one of his admirers, Colonel Carl Estes, Texas publisher and oil man, "Jack Garner is a Democrat who has no desire to substitute the autocracy of the masses for that of the classes." Garner would like to see relief dumped back on the states, with perhaps small federal contributions, but it is possible that even his conservative Democratic advisers would convince him of the impossibility of such an arrangement. Republicans and Democrats of all shades agree that certain New Deal measures, notably the Social Security Act, TVA, and perhaps the SEC, will have to be retained in principle, if not in spirit, no matter who heads the next Administration. Garner as President

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would also maintain such agencies as the FHA and the RFC, simply because they are self-supporting, middle-class agencies which, on the whole, meet the approval of a small-town banker like himself. If President Roosevelt is renominated, Garner will be given the chance to run again as Vice-President purely as a courtesy. And he will probably refuse it. Three terms as President are one thing; three sessions in the Vice-Presidential sinecure are quite another. As things now stand, John Nance Garner, retired, will be Uvalde's leading resident in 1941.

Labor Distrusts Chamberlain

BY ERNEST DAVIES

London, January 22

AS THE war develops, British Labor's doubts concerning it are strengthened rather than weakened. When Germany invaded Poland and Mr. Chamberlain appeared to hesitate about honoring England's guaranty, Arthur Greenwood, deputy leader of the Labor Party, was urged to "speak for England." He did so by demanding that a stand against Hitler's aggression be taken and our pledge to Poland honored. At that time the whole Labor movement, including, be it noted, the Communists, was behind him. Had Chamberlain not delivered an ultimatum to Germany, he would probably have been driven from office and the war would have taken place none the less. Support of the war at the outset, therefore, aroused little dissension in Labor's ranks. Doubts only began to arise when the conduct of the war became incomprehensible to the layman, and when many began to wonder whether the National Government was in earnest in its prosecution. This may have been due partly to the failure of the Allies to give any genuine help to Poland and to the widespread ignorance in this country of the dispatch of an expeditionary force to France. Labor's doubts were increased when Soviet Russia marched into Poland and effectively blocked Germany's advance eastward; here were explanation and justification of the German-Soviet pact. But with Russia's subsequent action in the Baltic, culminating in the invasion of Finland, they diminished. At the same time, however, concern spread as to whether a war conducted by a Conservative and capitalist government could really be that war for democracy and freedom the world was led to believe it to be. Had Russia left Finland alone, Labor's opposition to the war might have mounted to vociferous protest. Before Russia's aggression the Communists, who had suddenly reversed their support of the war against Nazism, even though the shift meant the expulsion of their general secretary from office, were able to make a case against the "imperialist" war, and they exploited the situation to the full.

The official Labor movement, however, at no time wavered in its support of the war. It issued a statement condemning Russia's invasion of Poland; and the party's leader, Clement Attlee, in his speech on Labor's peace aims, referred to Russia as "sharing the booty" with Germany. At this point the leadership was possibly more farsighted than the rank and file, with whom it seemed somewhat out of touch. This was partly because at first the impression was created that in supporting the war Labor was supporting the government. Later, when Labor leaders were invited to participate in the War Cabinet they refused to do so, making it clear that Labor wished to retain its political independence. In this they had the whole-hearted support of the entire movement. Labor would reserve its right to criticize the government in its conduct of the war, and at the same time give general support to the war effort.

But there were still sources of confusion. The Labor Party's agreement with the Conservatives and Liberals on a by-election truce was one of these. Under this agreement, when vacancies occurred for parliamentary seats, an election would not be fought, but the party which held the seat would nominate the candidate. This by-election truce was immediately interpreted as a political truce, extending to complete support of the government, come what might. It was not, however, so far-reaching, and the leaders have since made it clear that the by-election truce can be terminated at any time by either side, and that in the meantime normal political activities of the local parties should continue. The government, of course, took advantage of this truce, was inclined to interpret it as a complete surrender, and did its utmost to rope the Labor Party organization into war activities. It strove to make use of the party machine through Transport House, headquarters of the Labor movement. The local parties, however, used passive resistance and did not respond. Ministry of Information posters sent out by Transport House found their way into the waste-paper baskets, and pretense at cooperation has now ended. The demand to end the by-election pact has increased, and recently the Labor Party Executive, composed of representatives of the trade unions and political leaders, turned down by a very narrow margin a proposal to end it Confusion arises from the inability of the rank-and-file party member, whose work is for the most

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

part confined to electioneering, to conceive of any effective opposition outside election propaganda in the constituencies. To him a truce in by-elections means a political truce and the abandonment of all hope of removing the government as long as that truce exists. This state of affairs cannot last indefinitely because the rank-and-file member, who has been fighting the National Government since 1931 and has been loud in condemnation of its foreign policy from that date, cannot believe in its declared war aims now.

Refusal to cooperate and increasing doubts about the desirability of giving the government support in its prosecution of the war have their origin largely in distrust of the Chamberlain ministry. Swept along by the tide of oncoming war the whole Labor movement at first accepted the government's change of front. But belief that Mr. Chamberlain in his seventy-first year could switch from a policy of friendship to Germany to one of enmity proved only temporary. The Labor Party member no longer believes in the genuine conversion of a Prime Minister whose record has shown a decided preference for fascism over socialism. The more documents that are published disclosing the foreign policy of the government up to the outbreak of war, the greater the disbelief. The shrewd but quiescent voter who reads the official documents telling of the barbarities committed in Nazi Germany during the last years realizes that the government knew of these things when it was following a policy of appeasement. If, knowing these things, it still desired friendship with Germany, can it now, he asks, be fighting a war for a new social order? As the picture of the government's pre-war foreign policy emerges, he questions whether the government which destroyed the League of Nations and in effect acquiesced in aggression against Abyssinia, Austria, Spain, Czechoslovakia, and Albania, can be trusted to fight for democracy and freedom or even a federal Europe. It just does not appear logical. The government was formerly willing to shake hands with all it now claims to abhor and to condone the very antithesis of what it now professes to be fighting for. With these doubts latent in their minds, Laborites have watched the prosecution of the war with skepticism. The expulsion of Russia from the League when no action was taken against other aggressor nations reinforced their incredulity.

This distrust of the Chamberlain government is not based solely on its foreign policy, but equally on its actions at home both before and since the war. The National Government's pre-war record was one of protecting private monopoly. Precisely the same policy has been followed during the war. The government hesitates to go the whole way toward state capitalism; that is, it is reluctant to compel the subservience of all industry to the needs of the state. With the possible exception of the United States, England is the supreme example of the capitalist system. Before the war, state interference in industry was at a minimum. Manufacture was divided among a myriad of firms, and where coordination or cooperation existed it was instituted by the industry itself along monopoly lines, with only friendly state interference. In fact, government in Britain since 1931 has not only guarded capitalist interests at every turn but also aided them to build up monopolies which the state protected with tariffs and preferential taxation. The relationship between the state and industry became closer, but it was always on terms that showed the interests of private enterprise to be paramount. It is this hesitation to interfere with the capitalist organization of industry that has so far prevented the complete mobilization and control of production that must come if the war on the economic front is to be won.

When the outbreak of war made it necessary to switch production from a peace-time to a war-time basis, the government tended to rely upon capitalist industry to meet its requirements; where control was unavoidable, it handed it over to existing capitalist organizations, calling upon individual industrialists to act in an advisory capacity. In thus putting capitalist interests first the government is playing a dangerous game as regards the trade unions, which in the beginning were most cooperative. In fact, the trade-union leaders were even more active in their support of the government than Labor's political leaders. Now the industrial and political branches of the movement are becoming equally skeptical of the government's intentions, mainly because of its attack on the standard of living of the workers and its determination to prevent wages from rising.

Clement Attlee

This action on the part of the government is the inevitable outcome of the monetary, economic, and financial policy that it has embarked upon. Aware of the huge cost of the war, estimated already at $24,000,000 a day, the government fears inflation. Because inflation would be fatal to the capitalist system, desperate efforts are being made to prevent it. Runaway inflation can only be avoided in war time when war production is substituted for production for normal consumption, that is, when the war is financed through savings made on a very much increased scale. To achieve this, consumption must

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be reduced through increased taxation, voluntary or compulsory saving, rationing, or higher prices. Increased purchasing power in the hands of the community resulting from war spending must not be used to buy more goods. On the contrary, the government argues, current spending must be cut down. To bring this about the government is attempting to follow a very definite line. It wants to keep wages down so that the workers will not be in a position to consume more. Professor Maynard Keynes suggests that spending can be cut only if the worker is compelled to save by having a percentage of his wages deducted at the source and retained until after the war. Since two-thirds of the total consumption is originated by the workers, they must curtail their consumption. This argument has been accepted with alacrity by the government because it serves its interests. It does not want to increase direct taxation further; it views with horror any form of capital taxation; and it fears inflation because that would reduce the purchasing power of the rentier class.

The government has, therefore, from the outset of the war resisted all demands to adjust incomes to the increased cost of living. Old-age pensioners in receipt of $2.50 a week are only now to receive a meager increase as the result of a universal demand. Unemployment insurance remains unchanged, and expenditures on all social services are being restricted. Wage increases have taken place, but the government has repeatedly made it known that it views with concern any rise in the general level of wages. Mr. Chamberlain went so far as to declare in a recent speech that there should be no tying of wages to the cost of living: wages should not be automatically adjusted upward as prices rise. Such remarks, demonstrating the policy of the government, are anathema to the workers. Quite rightly they argue that even their pre-war wage left no margin, that they have never been able to maintain their families at the minimum standards set by the British Medical Council, and that they cannot meet any increase in living costs. If the government wishes to keep wages down, it must keep prices down. This it has failed to do because it has been reluctant to go the whole way in controlling production and distribution. It has left too much control to private enterprise; it delayed the introduction of rationing until prices had already risen; and far from stopping profiteering, it shares in it through its excess-profits tax. These are among the reasons why the workers will refuse to fall in line with government policy. If prices rise they will demand wage increases; and because, as Keynes has pointed out, in the race between prices and wages prices always win, inflation is threatened. To avoid it, the government must stick to its policy in the face of resistance from the trade unions, Labor, and the cooperative movement, and either tax wages or introduce compulsory saving. Repeated declarations of this policy by the Prime Minister and the Chancellor of the Exchequer are strongly influencing the attitude of Labor to the war.

The worker accepted the coming of war as inevitable. He believed we were fighting to end Hitlerism and all that Hitlerism represented—suppression of the working-class movement, tyrannical rule. He wanted to restore international law. He hoped to see a new world order arise after an Allied victory. At first he believed the National Government was fighting for these ends. The concentration of the demand for sacrifices on the wage-earning class has aroused serious doubts in his mind. He begins to wonder whether there is not something in the arguments put forward by the left wing of the movement that this is just another war between the rival imperialisms of the British and German empires. He wonders whether it is not after all just a capitalist government's fight to preserve capitalism, so that the capitalist class can continue to exploit the workers. While such doubts are beginning to stir in many minds, they have not necessarily been crystallized, and the government can yet win back or retain the workers' support through an effective demonstration of its sincerity of purpose. To attack the standard of living of the workers without clearly showing that the capitalist class is making even greater sacrifices is not the way. If the government kept prices down by enforcing reduced profit margins, if it increased taxation of the wealthier classes, even to the extent of a tax on capital, and if it extended state control over industry and prevented all profiteering, it might convince the worker that there was equality of sacrifice.

Since the invasion of Finland, Russia is playing a far less important role in the thinking of the worker, for he is whole-heartedly behind the Finns in their resistance. Nevertheless, he has not lost faith in the Russian Revolution, believing that Stalin has betrayed Russia and not Russia, socialism. Even Sir Walter Citrine, general secretary of the Trade Union Congress, who has always been critical of the Soviet Union, has issued a warning that the workers would not stand for a war against Russia. In this fact is found another reason for the workers' distrust of the Chamberlain government. They are fearful that if the war extends to Scandinavia, and if the Soviet-German alliance becomes closer, the government may ultimately be glad of an excuse to fight against Russia also.

The doubts existing in the minds of the workers must not be misinterpreted. In spite of them, British workers support the war now for the same reasons that animated them on September 3, 1939. They will fight for an Allied victory; they see no purpose in stopping the war today. They desire, however, the fall of the present British government as much as the defeat of the German. As long as the Tories remain in power, Labor will continue to doubt whether the war is being fought for the reasons given, and whether out of it can come a just peace which will build a new order in Europe.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Marxism Reconsidered—III

BY LEWIS COREY

TRANSITION TO A NEW ORDER

THE popular unity that a people's functional socialism might create would make possible a democratic transition to the new order. Such a transition depends upon successful action to solve the economic crisis, to release the forces of abundance and raise the standard of living of all functional groups. Lack of such action was a shortcoming of the "popular front." The "front" was doomed by its defensive nature, for democracy cannot survive the totalitarian danger and grow if it stands still. Failure to solve the economic crisis means a cat-and-dog struggle of group against group for a larger share in the smaller output of a shrinking economy. Those are the conditions upon which fascism feeds. What is needed is aggressive action based on a program of measures to solve the economic crisis which will at the same time create a transition to the new order.

That kind of program is possible today. For capitalism is already being transformed, *and effective economic measures to solve the crisis must mean the progressive transformation of capitalism toward democratic socialism.* We must seize upon that unity and formulate it in a transitional program of social-economic reconstruction.

The program I suggest means gradualism. Social Democratic gradualism failed? Yes and no. Social Democracy was right in its emphasis on democracy and gradualism; but it misunderstood democracy, and its gradualism never had any teeth and never drove toward socialism. Moreover, the older gradualism was limited and distorted by the upswing of capitalism; economic expansion and relative prosperity provided no base upon which to advance toward socialism. That base is now provided by capitalist decline and crisis, which compel increasing state intervention in economic activity, whatever the form of government. That intervention is good or bad, progressive or reactionary, depending solely upon whether or not it heads in the direction of democratic collectivism. It can be made the starting-point of a new gradualism that avoids both Social Democratic futility and Communist catastrophism.

There is no sharp economic break between capitalism and socialism. If the measures of a transitional program are forthright and direct, if they create a new economic balance that solves the crisis while safeguarding democracy, the cumulative effects must mean a progressive transformation of capitalism into democratic socialism. An effective transitional program involves a minimum of strategic economic changes: nationalization of investment and credit, because capitalist decline and crisis are primarily the result of a relative economic maturity that offers decreasing opportunity for the private investment of capital, upon which capitalist economic activity depends; nationalization of large-scale industry, because its systematic limitation of output and its monopoly share of corporate profits unbalance the whole economic system; and planning, because it is now evident that the economy is no longer self-adjusting and the new social controls must be deliberately unified. These are strategic controls that might solve the economic crisis while moving toward socialism. They allow room for the encouragement and free play of small independent enterprise and investment. Small business has everything to gain by a release from monopoly exploitation and by renewal of economic activity on higher levels. That is equally true of the farmers, although special measures are necessary in their case. Such a program of transitional reconstruction limits the number of interests that must be destroyed, while it promotes the interests of all useful functional groups and so creates a popular movement that may beat down reactionary opposition.

But if there is no sharp *economic* break between capitalism and socialism, there are differences that must be recognized. Failure to recognize them may imply a groundless faith in measures to make capitalism—not the economic system—work; it may mean efforts to escape the minimum of fundamental strategic controls. The ensuing failure will multiply totalitarian controls, whereas limitation of government controls is necessary for a democratic transition to the new order.

And what shape shall that new order take? What institutional arrangements are necessary to overcome the totalitarian potential in collectivism, to make that collectivism democratic? While collectivism is the inescapable economic basis of the new order, the collectivism need not be absolute or all-inclusive. Nationalization, or collective ownership, should be limited by definite ends: to break oligarchical capitalist controls, to balance the economic system, to release the forces of abundance, to plan. This can be done in an economic set-up which permits independent ownership among small enterprisers, farmers, and cooperatives. Nor need there be absolute centralization of power even in the nationalized economic sector. Advances in technology make decentralization more efficient. Moreover, decentralization of enterprises and plants permits of that regional decentralization which is necessary for a balanced national

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

economy. Another limitation and control of power is available in the representation of all functional interests in the administration of nationalized enterprises: labor, management, and consumers, as well as regional and local interests. The democratic force of such economic arrangements is clear. Diversity of economic forms and interests and their freedom of action are safeguards against tyranny. Decentralization of economic institutions, authority, and controls encourages initiative, freedom of decision, and democratic responsibility.

Planning is wholly practical within a system of limited nationalization that allows for a large measure of economic decentralization, independent property, and cooperatives. What are the ends of planning? To create a new, upward-moving economic balance, to release the forces of abundance, to serve all functional interests. This can be done with planning limited to regulation of strategic economic factors: investment and large-scale industry, the relation between capital goods and consumption goods, prices. It is not necessary that planning should control all economic activity. And planning is wholly practical, too, with a money-and-market mechanism which, although deprived of its absolute control of production and investment, allows freedom of choice to the consumers.

These institutional arrangements limit the danger of bureaucratic totalitarianism but do not destroy it. An additional factor is necessary: freedom of association, the independence of employee organizations and other functional groups in relation to the political and economic bureaucracy. The traditional socialist idea of "workers' ownership," is ambiguous, and it promotes bureaucratic usurpation of power. For between the workers and the industries they "own" is interposed the bureaucratic state, which under a system of absolute collective ownership wields effective power over economic institutions. The twin ideas of "workers' ownership" and "workers' state" permit the bureaucracy to raise the question, as it does in Russia: Why independent unions? Why should workers strike against themselves, their industries, and their state? The answer, it is now clear, is that the workers remain workers. The wage relation still remains, and in a worse form where there is no democracy and the state is the only employer: wage slavery is absolute. Workers should have at least as much right to strike against the government-employer as against the capitalist employer. Syndicalism offered a solution in the form of union ownership of industry, but that would strengthen bureaucracy through the combination of control over unions and industry. Unions must have a share in management along with other functional interests and groups. But they must keep their independence. It is the tragedy of labor, in Communist Russia as in Fascist Germany and Italy, that "unions" are instruments of bureaucratic control of the workers. Trade unionism, unlike socialism, is a creation of the workers and the bulwark of their democratic rights under capitalism and socialism. Independent unions, with the right of collective bargaining and the right to strike, must exist to protect the interests of the workers who still remain workers and to limit the threat of bureaucracy.

For bureaucracy is the chief danger, though socialism and Marxism have shown amazingly little awareness of that fact. Another millennial abstraction behind which lurk a dangerous unclarity and ambiguity that make for bureaucratic totalitarianism is the socialist idea that the abolition of capitalism means abolition of all class distinctions and exploitation and of all conflict of economic interests. The truth is that all sorts of distinctions and conflicts remain. New forms of exploitation may arise, and the bureaucracy may become a new ruling class. Only all-inclusive democracy can overcome the danger. To weaken or yield political democracy to get economic democracy will end in no democracy at all. There must be the freest expression of conflicting interests and ideas under socialism. That is why there is no room for the one-party system or for the destruction of parliamentarism. Nor is there room for the Marxist governmental theory of the combination of powers as contrasted with the democratic concept of separation of powers. We need, in fact, a new application of the system of checks and balances to limit the power of state and bureaucracy in favor of largely self-governing economic and cultural institutions and groups; a new application of the old liberal theory that "that state is best which governs least."

MARX AND THE STATE

Combination of powers and the abolition of parliamentarism are facets of Marx's theory that the proletariat cannot use the existing state for its own purposes but must destroy the state and build anew. The theory is logical *if* the state is only an organ of class oppression and *if* the proletariat must seize political power and impose "its" dictatorship over the people. But what are the results? Lenin himself gave part of the answer in the final years of his life—the efforts to build a "democratic commune" according to the formula of Marx having proved a failure—when on several occasions he pointed out that the Soviet state was a "bourgeois and czarist mechanism . . . borrowed from czarism and barely touched by the Soviet world. . . . At the top we have perhaps 10,000—I don't know how many—of our own people; in the lower ranks hundreds of thousands of former czarist officials. . . . The Soviet state mechanism is a survival to a large extent of the former bureaucracy . . . with only a superficial new coat of paint." It now seems obvious that no other result was possible. A governing personnel is not created overnight. Dictatorship, which is inevitable if the state must be destroyed and built anew, crushes vital democratic elements that might

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have been introduced into the state mechanism to democratize it; the new "proletarian" masters and the most unprincipled and servile of the old bureaucratic crowd merge finally into a new bureaucratic despotism which is independent of democratic pressures and ideas. *The new state, which was to be the servant of society, becomes a new, more monstrous, and absolute master of society, the mastery being modified neither by parliamentarism nor by a system of checks and balances.* All states develop their own self-interests, which can be made to serve society only through greater democracy. The Marxist theory may have seemed justified in backward countries, where the state was almost exclusively an organ of class oppression. But Russian experience proves the contrary. And the theory is even more obviously untenable for advanced countries like the United States, where the state has a usable democratic tradition, is still responsive to democratic pressures, and performs an unusually large and growing number of constructive services. We must learn to use the democratic state, overcome its class nature and limitations, democratize it still further with greater popular controls, and increase its constructive services. Upon this depend the democratic transition to socialism and democratic socialism itself. The task, it is true, is a hard one. But we must find ways of doing it. The alternative is the "easy" Marxist way, which, history now shows, ends in totalitarian nightmare.

One final word on the state. Its powers necessarily increase during the transition from capitalism to socialism. There are dangers in that situation which traditional socialism dismissed, as many non-Marxist radicals do today. The dangers were dismissed largely because the Marxist theory assumes that as socialism abolishes classes the need for the state disappears and it "withers away." Marx did a great job of stripping off the metaphysical wrappings of the state by giving it a definite historical location and meaning. But his theory was shaped too much by the nature of the capitalist state, which is dominated by an economic ruling class that derives its economic power from property ownership. Its serious limitations are clearly revealed when the theory is projected either backward or forward. The feudal lords were not an economic ruling class; it was political control over the land that gave them economic power. Similarly, the bureaucratic caste under socialism has no direct economic power in the form of property ownership, and Marxists therefore conclude that it cannot become a ruling class. But it may, in fact, become a new ruling class with vested interests intrenched indirectly in the political control of economic power instead of directly, as under capitalism, in economic power itself. That leads to the "feudal socialism" toward which communism and fascism move. Another limitation of the Marxist theory of the state is the conception of the proletariat as the final ruling class in a succession of ruling classes. Logically, however, if there is to be a new ruling class it will be the new middle-class bureaucracy because of its strategic position in government and industry. Such a class, whether Communist or Fascist, *must* rule by means of a totalitarian state, since its privileges and power are wholly political. The answer to that threat is democracy. A system of pluralism in government and industry which permits the largest measure of self-government and freedom of expression and action to the community's economic and cultural interests is the final assurance of a democratic collectivism, a functional democracy.

[*This is the concluding section of Mr. Corey's article.*]

A Lincoln Nobody Knew

BY I. F. STONE

JUDGING from the quality of the speeches made by leading Republican hopefuls on Lincoln's Birthday the country may be in danger of a fourth term for Mr. Roosevelt. The speeches were not altogether bad. Some of the phrases were good, but the good ones had all been used by Lincoln. At Portland Mr. Dewey said we had been too long a house divided and declared it time "real economic freedom" was restored so that government of the people, by the people, and for the people should not perish from the earth. At Grand Rapids Governor James of Pennsylvania thought we ought to bear malice toward none, except possibly New Dealers. At Oklahoma City Senator Bridges was certain that "industry, labor, and agriculture alike cannot progress half free and half under the domination of those who hold public office" unless, of course, the office-holders were Republicans. One began to wonder whether Lincoln died to free Republican politicians from the necessity of writing their own speeches. Those who invoked Lincoln were as bad as those who borrowed from him. Mr. Hoover, who sat without fidgeting in the same Cabinet with Fall and Daugherty, appealed for more morals in government in order to "assure Abraham Lincoln's America." John D. M. Hamilton, with that flair for the right time and place that has made him so helpful to Mr. Farley, picked the Waldorf-Astoria as the setting for a speech calling Lincoln's common people "the backbone of the nation." These were Mr. Hamilton's exact words. I hope I infringe no copyright by quoting them. Senator Capper, with some aid from Julia Ward Howe, worked himself into a fine crescendo at Baltimore. "Abraham Lincoln's soul," he cried, "is marching on." He might have added that his party seems to lie a-moldering in the grave.

Were it not for Bruce Barton I should be content to leave these speeches to closely reasoned analysis by Mr. Lippmann. Mr. Barton's Lincoln's Birthday speech at Buffalo, if not what one would ordinarily term memo-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rable, was certainly something to remember. At Buffalo he set out to do for Lincoln what he once did for Jesus. Some readers may recall, though with mixed emotions, Bruce Barton's "The Man Nobody Knows." One chapter of the Gospel According to Barton was headed A Founder of Modern Business, and a passage that should be famous said that the parables were "marvelously condensed, as all good advertising must be." Barton's Lincoln, like his Jesus, is not cut to conventional patterns. "We are met here," he said at Buffalo, "to honor the memory of an American who was ill fed, ill clothed, ill housed—and did not know it." "Inwardly warmed by spiritual fires," he continued, holding up Lincoln as an example to the unemployed, "he was almost unconscious of being ill fed or well fed, ill clothed or well clothed, ill housed or well housed." These spiritual fires would be useful in balancing the budget, but they suggest a dangerously high capacity for sales resistance. A man who doesn't know—or care—whether he is ill fed or well fed is not an encouraging business prospect.

The Lincoln Nobody Knows goes too far. "The Man Nobody Knows" may have seemed bizarre, but Bruce Barton knew what he was doing. The book swung lightly from what Jesus said on the Mount to what the chairman of the board said in the Pullman lounge, and the reader was given to understand that both voiced eternal verities. Barton's Jesus flattered business. Barton's Lincoln seems less than respectful of widely advertised business products. Mr. Barton was not content to say that Lincoln was born in a log cabin. He emphasized that it was a log cabin "without heat, running water, or any modern convenience." He commented loftily that "according to a philosophy now widely current, this was a hopeless environment." Sources less radical than the New Deal spread propaganda for plumbing.

The clothing industry is spending no money to disprove the notion that clothes make the man. Mr. Barton insisted on being an iconoclast. "His clothes," he said of Lincoln, "were of crude homespun, ill fitting, and worn until the fabric would no longer patch." This is not orthodox Hart, Schaffner, and Marxism. Lincoln's "diet of corn pone and bacon," Mr. Barton gloated, "lacked essential vitamins." Does he think this will endear him to tomato-juice accounts?

A few unthinking business men may be pleased by Barton's Lincoln. An America in which young men didn't know or care whether they were ill fed, ill clothed, or ill housed would be an America that didn't bother about higher wages. But it would also be an America emancipated from free wheeling, tiled bathrooms, five-foot bookshelves, and Sunkist oranges. Mr. Barton's program may allow for an occasional Lincoln, but it implies a mass of Jeeter Lesters. "Be Poor White Trash—and Like It" is a snappy slogan, but not for vote-getting. Even Mr. Hoover had the tact to call it rugged individualism.

Everybody's Business

BY KEITH HUTCHISON

Poor Man's Credit

MONEY is cheap today. The cost to the Treasury of borrowing on short-term bills is infinitesimal; in fact, there have been occasions recently when lenders were willing to pay the government for using their money. New 4¾-year Treasury notes were offered in December last on a 1 per cent interest basis, while 12-to-14-year bonds carrying a 2¼ per cent coupon stand 3 points above par. Cities and states can obtain loans almost as cheaply, and private corporations with first-class credit standing find a ready market for 3 per cent bonds. If you want a million dollars and have the right kind of credit rating, your bank will probably give you a warm welcome and make you a term loan for six or seven years for as little as 2 per cent. Even if you only wanted a thousand, and were able to provide ample Stock Exchange collateral, you could do business on a 4 per cent basis.

Most people, however, have no formal credit rating, but nevertheless stand in need of loans from time to time. There are a variety of agencies anxious to cater to them but not at 4 per cent. A person with a steady salaried job can apply to a commercial bank with a personal-loan department, and if his credentials are considered satisfactory can obtain a loan for 10 per cent or a little less. More expensive is credit received from industrial banks of the Morris Plan kind. According to one of the valuable economic studies sponsored by the Twentieth Century Fund,* the average cost to a borrower of an industrial-bank loan is about 16 per cent, or nearly three times the normal commercial-bank discount rate on small business loans. Moreover, the signature of a relative or friend as comaker is required for the typical loan of this kind. Borrowers from personal finance companies are not called upon to find an outside comaker but are asked for a wage assignment and a chattel mortgage. The cost, however, is again higher and may legally be as much as 36 per cent per annum on sums of less than $150.

None of the institutions mentioned, however, fulfil the needs of the low-paid worker requiring $5 or $10 to tide him over between pay days. If he has anything to pledge he may get accommodation from a pawnbroker, whose charges will range from 1 to 10 per cent per month. A man who lives in New York City can apply to the Provident Loan Society, a limited-dividend company conducting a pawnbroking business and charging only ¾ per cent per month, or 9 per cent per annum. Finally, he can have recourse to one of the numerous "loan sharks" who still flourish despite the laws against them. And, indeed, in a sense they do perform a social function in that they provide credit, albeit at an exorbitant rate, to people who desperately need it and cannot get it from any respectable source.

The high cost of small loans is not due to monopoly, nor is it, as might be assumed, necessitated by a tremendous ratio of bad debts. The primary cause is the amount of labor in-

* "Does Distribution Cost Too Much?" Twentieth Century Fund. $3.50.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

volved in preliminary investigation and in collections. A special report of the New York State Superintendent of Banks just issued shows that the chief expense item in the accounts of licensed lenders in the state is salaries, which on the average amount to nearly 5½ per cent of the assets employed in the business. Advertising and federal taxes both cost more than bad debts, which average only 1.62 per cent.

The New York Licensed Lenders' Act of 1932, which is paralleled by legislation in many other states, applies to all persons lending sums of $300 or less at rates greater than 6 per cent a year, except pawnbrokers and institutions chartered under other sections of the banking law. It provides for the supervision and regulation of their business practices and prescribes maximum charges of 3 per cent per month on that part of a loan not in excess of $150, and 2½ per cent thereafter. These rates may seem usurious as compared with the cost of money to men of substance, but the fixing of maximum charges is a delicate business. The object of the legislation was to attract capital to the legitimate small-loan field and thus circumscribe the activities of the "loan shark." To a considerable extent it has succeeded. The number of licensees in the state rose from 78 in 1932 to 269 in 1938, and loans outstanding increased from $10,000,000 to $55,000,000.

According to the report previously mentioned, which analyzes in detail financial returns made by licensed lenders in accordance with the 1932 act, net earnings of the business as a whole amount to 11.25 per cent on used and useful assets. But as the larger firms in the business are able to obtain part of their capital at comparatively low rates of interest, the return on their equity is far above even this handsome ratio. Household Finance Corporation, one of the two large chain enterprises which do some 40 per cent of the total volume of regulated small-loan business throughout the country, had gross assets at the end of 1939 of $74,518,000. Of its capital liabilities $24,460,000 was represented by bank loans, on which the average interest may be as low as 2 per cent, and $18,000,000 by 5 per cent preference shares. Common stock and surplus amounted to $28,787,000, or just under 40 per cent of the total capital employed, receiving a net return of almost 19 per cent.

The average charges of this company to borrowers are below the legal maxima, and as it is probably more efficiently organized than the smaller offices, its proportion of operating expenses may be rather lower. It serves to illustrate, however, the profit-making potentialities of the small-loan business and justifies the contention of the New York Superintendent of Banks that the time has come to reduce legal rates. His proposals, which Governor Lehman has recommended to the legislature, are for a maximum of 2½ per cent per month on any part of a loan not exceeding $100 and 2 per cent thereafter. The resulting saving to borrowers, on a loan volume equal to that of 1938, will be, he calculates, $2,392,163—an addition to the purchasing power of the poorest section of the community which is not to be despised. It is to be hoped, therefore, that the legislature will act speedily on the Governor's recommendations, which have been incorporated in a bill sponsored by Senator Gutman of Brooklyn and Assemblyman Cariello of Queens, and that other states will consider similar action.

In the Wind

PHILADELPHIA CITY EDITORS received a terse release last Christmas from the local recruiting headquarters of the United States Army. It read: "The inclosed Christmas dinner menu of the Quartermaster School, Schuylkill Arsenal, 2620 Gray's Ferry Road, Philadelphia, may be of some interest to your readers. The army still lacks about 17,000 men in its efforts to reach the goal of 227,000 set by the President, and the publication of this essentially normal seasonal menu which is prepared annually at the many army posts throughout the nation and its possessions might show the way to some young men to a better future."

OVER THE United Press wires last week came reports of a student strike at Young Harris College, Georgia. The dispatch reported that "a strike of 250 students for the right to hold hands with co-eds was under control tonight. . . . After Dr. Lance [president of the college] expelled five ringleaders of the fight for hand-holding he warned their surviving classmates: 'This is one institution where the faculty will not brook bolshevism.'"

A MINOR DIPLOMATIC crisis occurred in Miami recently. President Vincent of Haiti, a Negro, planned to stop there on his way to Washington. First he was told he would have to live in the Negro quarter; when he protested he was offered the whole floor of a hotel. State Department officials vetoed that plan as being another form of segregation.

THERE IS GROWING evidence of a rift between J. Edgar Hoover and liberals in the Department of Justice. That Hoover owes his post to a liberal Supreme Court Justice, Harlan F. Stone, is not generally known. Hoover was appointed by Stone when the latter was Attorney General; in 1932, after the Republican defeat, most departments were overhauled, and Hoover was slated to go. Stone quietly exerted pressure to have him retained on the ground that the post should be "above politics." Hoover was kept.

CAMPAIGN NEWS: Paul McNutt's campaign headquarters are at 1 Wall Street, but his stationery is stamped 80 Broadway, another entrance to the building, because "Wall Street" sounds sinister. . . . Key figure at Garner's New York headquarters is William Goodwin, intimate of Father Coughlin and recipient of Coughlin's ardent support when he ran for Congress in '36.

THE NEW SPAIN: In a recent address reported in the Spanish press, José Maria Alfaro, Under Secretary for Press and Propaganda in the women's section of Falange, complained: "Bayonet in hand, under Franco's command, we were able to win a war, but we have not succeeded yet in reaching far down into the sensibility of our enemies or even in winning to our side those who profess to be our friends."

[*We invite our readers to submit material for In the Wind —either clippings with source and date or stories that can be clearly authenticated. A prize of $5 will be awarded each month for the best item.*—EDITORS THE NATION.]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Issues and Men

BY OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD

BECAUSE my opposition to a third term for Mr. Roosevelt is so well known, I am constantly receiving requests that I name my candidate. I can think of several men who have shown themselves to be great administrators, true patriots, liberal-minded citizens, and unusually capable leaders. If the Democratic Party were thinking less of votes and more of the genuine needs of the country it could not fail to give the most serious attention to the records of Harold Ickes, Secretary of the Interior; Henry Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture; and Joseph B. Eastman of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Since the selection rests upon something else than proved administrative ability, these suggestions will be ruled out at once as totally unpractical. Take Mr. Eastman, for example. It will be said that he is not known to the country as a whole, that he has lived in Washington too long to be identified with any state, and that he has no political influence. These things are true. Yet the fact remains that his record is an extraordinarily fine one: he has shown unusual ability; he has worked himself up in the government service; and he has proved again and again that he has intellectual ability of a very high order. Secretary Ickes has antagonized the politicians and is regarded as not a Democrat because he used to be a Republican progressive. Secretary Wallace has antagonized the farmers—or many of them—and so it goes. But I repeat that if our party conventions were genuine, free debating affairs bent only on choosing the fittest men to lead the government in Washington, these men would have to be considered among the first.

Since they are ruled out because of the decay of our nominating system, one must look elsewhere. Usually the choice is made from among Governors and Senators. There is no outstanding Democratic Governor. Were Governor Lehman of New York not a Jew—I say this with shame and humiliation—he would naturally be considered, although he is not an orator or a man to rouse great popular enthusiasm. When one thinks how often the Governor of New York has been nominated or come near to being nominated for the Presidency, it is obvious that if almost anyone else now held the position he would be considered. Of the Senators only two stand out, Burton K. Wheeler and Bennett C. Clark. But the New Deal backers have never forgiven Wheeler because he opposed the packing of the Supreme Court by the President, which time has proved to be so unnecessary. Sometimes I agree with the statement recently made by Senator Wheeler that liberals often seem more intolerant than conservatives. At least many of them are so unforgiving that if a man once deviates from the course they have marked out he is at once tagged with having sold out to big business. Wheeler is criticized for having made speeches that were favorably received by the merchants' associations before which he spoke, while his appearances before great labor bodies, like the United Mine Workers, are carefully overlooked. It is said that he cannot be trusted, and so that is an end to him. Senator Clark, whose health has not been good of late, has refused to allow his friends to run him as a candidate. The reason that I should consider his nomination very favorably is that, as I have written before, I trust him absolutely on the all-important question of war and peace. If he, the son of Champ Clark, should come out for our going to war, I should give up all hope of finding anyone who would withstand the war hysteria.

The new Justice of the Supreme Court, William O. Douglas, ought surely to be considered. I am well aware of the objections to taking a judge from the Supreme Court—I was one of those who were much disturbed when Justice Charles E. Hughes ran for the Presidency in 1916. But if a man is capable and the country needs him in a higher position, I do not think that prejudice ought to stand in the way. Nor do I find a reason against Justice Douglas's selection in the fact that he is not known to the country at large. A candidate speedily becomes known if he has the intellectual qualities necessary for leadership; if he is not a Landon he is bound to impress the public very soon. Mr. Douglas has risen to a very high position without influence, solely on his merits, and he ought to be carefully considered. I have not spoken of Mr. Hull because there are obvious reasons why he could not stand the strain of a campaign and the Presidential office.

I am not in the least impressed by the statement that if war comes to us we must have President Roosevelt to direct our participation. In that event, more than ever, we shall need a great administrator, and Mr. Roosevelt is anything but that. Some months ago, in an article which called forth violent protest, I wrote that he ought to think less about Europe and more about home conditions and apply himself to domestic problems. I was denounced as a "tired old liberal," as one who had sold out to the interests and gone conservative. It has amused me, therefore, to find both Matthew Woll and John Lewis saying exactly the same thing about the administrative failure of the New Deal. A great administrator is what the hour calls for, and if either party wishes to serve the Republic it will look primarily for such a candidate.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS *and the* ARTS

Faith, Hope, and Clarity

THERE is something very appealing in the spectacle of Oswald Garrison Villard invading the Nazi hell and lecturing the devils on the iniquity of their behavior. I can fairly hear him holding forth on human rights and a free press. He says in his little book "Within Germany" (D. Appleton-Century, $1) that he intended to say "Heil, Roosevelt!" to any greetings of "Heil, Hitler!" but had no opportunity. When Mr. Villard wrote this book, he was the first American journalist to have been in both Germany and England after the outbreak of war, and the first outside journalist to visit Prague since July, 1939. He brought back a picture of a confused and depressed people, opposed to the regime, to its persecution of the Jews, to the war, yet going along because they feel helpless in the face of overwhelming terror—"the other fellow has the revolvers"—but also for other reasons. "Unfortunately," says Mr. Villard, "patriotism and the Hitler teachings that the men of a nation live only to die on the battlefield are bound to hold millions in line who at heart do not like the Nazis or their creed."

Perhaps the most striking chapter in the book is the seventh, which describes the herding of Jews into a "Jewish state" in Poland, a stretch of land 80 by 100 kilometers, inclosed by barbed wire, which is in reality a vast concentration camp where prisoners are dying like flies from cold, disease, and starvation. In Germany proper, he says, Jews sit in their homes, "and every time the doorbell rings, they expect that the order to prepare for immediate departure for Poland, and what they consider certain death, has come." The order came two weeks ago to the 1,200 Jews of Stettin, who were allowed to take with them only food for two days and a single suitcase of clothing.

Mr. Villard closes his book with an Epilogue entitled England at War which made me feel he had better look to his reputation as a pacifist and an isolationist. He justly regards all wars as senseless; for good reasons, based on his experience of the last one, his mind rejects the present conflict as merely another European struggle for power; but his heart belongs to the Allies, not because they have treated it so well but because he cannot face the prospect of a Hitler victory. His book ends as follows: "Goodby, England! I go unafraid. For Justice, Humanity, and Right are standing on your right hand. And to them Victory will come in time."

I should be the last to reproach Mr. Villard for his inconsistency, for I am bothered by the same internal conflict. And what makes reproach even more irrelevant is the probability that his state of mind-versus-heart mirrors the predicament of the great majority of Americans. The prospect of the United States getting involved in another European war, and another European peace, under the auspices of Chamberlain and Daladier is the most revolting of all prospects—except that of a Europe organized by Hitler and Stalin. On the left only the Trotskyists and the Communists have it easy these days. They say it is another imperialist war, and they say the hell with it. What's more, to them the Russian attack on Finland is one step in the world revolution. Only the other day a Communist sympathizer asked what difference there was between what Stalin is doing and world revolution—to such depths has revolutionary "thinking" sunk. Since, to such men of faith, there can be neither socialism nor genuine democracy until capitalism is overthrown, they do not flinch before the idea that Europe may have to undergo the ordeal of totalitarianism, red and brown, secure in the certainty that a united and collective Europe and presumably a classless and democratic Europe must eventually emerge. (For the Communists, of course, the "socialist democracy" of Russia is the model!)

It would be stupid to deny that there is a dynamism in Russian and German totalitarianism that seems to be more powerful than that of democracy in the non-fascist nations. This drive is anti-capitalist; it is also collectivist; but above all it is anti-democratic. And Lewis Corey, in the first of the series of articles concluded in this issue, demonstrated thoroughly enough for most of us the fact that collectivism without democracy equals fascism. The mind rejects the thesis that the proletariat will inevitably have its innings even if Hitler and Stalin overrun Europe, or that if it does it will get anything better than it has today in Russia. The dictatorship of the proletariat is a myth that will be hard to revive in this generation at least—and there is no apparent reason why collective totalitarianism cannot go on indefinitely.

And so, throwing neutrality to the winds, most of us hope the Allies and the Finns will win and cannot bring ourselves to deny them the material aid that may drag us in. Meanwhile, we hug the isolationist hope that they will win in time to keep America from entering what is bound to be another shambles abroad, even if they do win, and a new dictatorship at home.

I do not pretend to have the answer to this dilemma. But in concentrating so exclusively on a dilemma we cannot hope to resolve, aren't we neglecting a job we have at least a chance of accomplishing? Charmed by the spectacle of Europe as by some fabulous deadly snake, we have pretty much turned our backs on America. This group on the left is spending too much energy on campaigns to keep America out of war; that one is spending too much energy on paper projects to keep the European belligerents from making a bad peace. Both are legitimate and admirable objectives; both are negative and cursed with vagueness. One of their few positive effects is to create a rift between groups which are certainly united in their desire to do something fundamental about unemployment, monopoly, and all the other problems that will consign us, unless they are solved, to the fate of Europe, whether we go into this war or stay out. Certainly none will deny that the political temptation to foreign adventures will grow as our own economic situation

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

worsens; if we become involved, there is no doubt that the speed and the certainty with which the inevitable war-time dictatorship "withers away" will depend on the strength of our economy. If we don't become involved, the mills of the economic gods will continue to grind on and not so slowly either.

I have no illusions about the extent or depth of capitalist democracy. But neither have I any illusions about the imminence of a socialist, democratic world as an inevitable sequence of the "second imperialist war." That happy event lies at the end of a long road of preparation. I happen to think that it has infinitely more chance of being carried on in the "capitalist democracy" of England and France even in war time than in a totalitarian Europe even if it were collectivist. But it can best be carried on in the United States of America—now.

In relation to the war, liberals and socialists, it seems to me, can do a few realistic things. They can strengthen the hand of the left in England and France by raising a continuous howl over war-time infringements of civil rights, by preserving in general a sharply critical attitude toward the Chamberlain and Daladier governments, and by refusing to be taken in by appeals for total support in the name of democracy in the face of such negations of democracy as the British government's present treatment of India's just demands. I should like to see a campaign in America on the Indian question. It would have the advantage of being geared to a specific, clear, and extremely vital issue; the British government is very sensitive on the matter of India, and it cannot afford to ignore American opinion unless that opinion is allowed to remain inarticulate. We should maintain a healthy skepticism toward the spate of plans for post-war Europe, pick and choose between concrete, possible programs and vague, high-flown schemes which may in the end mainly serve, like Wilson's Fourteen Points, as a smoke screen for the real work being carried on in diplomatic back rooms. The surest way to get bad terms is to postulate impossible or vague ones. Harold Nicolson's "Peacemaking, 1919," is very illuminating on this point.

But the main job, war in and war out, is at home. We must realize and force others to realize that unemployment and not the fighting on the Karelian Isthmus is a matter of life and death to the future of this country. We happen to inhabit an enormous and rich continent where economic convulsions that in a smaller country like Germany threw up a Hitler are dissipated like the splash of a stone in a lake. Even with 10,000,000 unemployed the rest of us are not actually aware of the catastrophe in our daily lives. But that cannot go on forever. The state of mind and body of that one-third of our people who are ill fed and ill housed must gradually undermine the well-being and the pleasant liberties of the other two-thirds. I am in favor of helping the Finns, but in the long run it won't do us any good to help the Finns unless we do something specific and far-reaching about the thousands of farm workers who are living on nothing a year or wandering over the country looking for a place to settle. (Dorothea Lange, coauthor of "An American Exodus," reports that 8,000 families entered California in January, more than at the height of the Dust Bowl migration.)

It is admittedly difficult to dramatize an issue like unemployment. Government relief has stopped headline hunger riots; it has also lulled the left into a false security. But it is our job to find ways of dramatizing unemployment. . . . Labor must be enlisted in a campaign for a decent house for every American family. . . . Let's have TVA clubs as well as a Paquet au Front. . . . Let's hound the Administration and Congress until they are forced to act on the railroads, public health, and all the other problems. Too many of us have joined the Sidewalk Superintendents to watch Europe being torn down—while our own house is slowly falling to pieces. I know that the European war impinges on every domestic issue, but I don't believe it rules out completely the possibility of doing something about that man who has been out of work or out of land so long that he will soon be fit for nothing but tinder for a demagogue's inflammatory breath.

The fact that the do-nothing psychology of an election year is likely to be extended until the war is settled one way or another makes it all the more imperative to build fires under politicians and carry on the job of clarifying and defining and acting upon domestic issues.

It may be, of course, that the dogmatists of the left will turn out to be right. Perhaps it is impossible to extend the limits of economic democracy peacefully, even though they have been extended in the past. One thing, however, is sure: the chances grow slighter as time goes on.

MARGARET MARSHALL

Mr. Mencken's Cranford

HAPPY DAYS: 1880-1892. By H. L. Mencken. Alfred A. Knopf. $2.75.

THIS bright and aromatic memoir, emerging from the *Menckendämmerung* that for a decade has shrouded the fire-eating and fire-striking angers of its author's prime, will doubtless confirm in the minds of his baiters and nay-sayers the backsliding reaction of his latter-day views on politics, progress, and literature. The more so since "Happy Days" is offered without apologies as recording the childhood, "placid, secure, uneventful, and happy," of "a larva of the comfortable and complacent bourgeoisie," who was "encapsulated in affection and kept fat, saucy, and contented"; as having "no psychological, sociological, or politico-economic significance"; as the testimony of a man who, though his "days of work have been spent . . . in recording the current scene, usually in a far from acquiescent spirit," must now admit that he has "found existence on this meanest of planets extremely amusing, and, taking one day with another, perfectly satisfactory."

The glow of serene and chuckling affection that bathes the ensuing twenty chapters will thus be taken by all well-equipped psychologists as a more than adequate explanation of the fury with which Mr. Mencken once laid about him against every threat of smugness and puritanism that endangered his birthright. He has never lost the verve and exhilaration that came to him as his portion of the German-American *Gemütlichkeit* of Baltimore. His pages show that he neither lived that life nor was felled at an early age by the "terrific impact" of "Huckleberry Finn" in vain. Obviously no later standards of mental harmony or high serious-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ness could equal those of his life's first decade. If those first years gave him his zest for the good life they also gave him his sense of the bad: of every spurious dogmatism, inhibition, maggot of reform, and self-righteous theory of existence that rose to chide the well-fed Americanism of his boyhood. He tells us that his early Sunday-school tutelage by the Reverend Sylvanus Stall, D. D., didn't take; that this famous moral hygienist's "What a Young Boy Ought to Know" was wasted on his ears. It may, however, be the irony of Mr. Mencken's old age to have his happiest book used not merely as an opportunity for dreadful pointings of the finger by social and economic moralists but for a fresh "explosion of the Freudian ammunition dump of horrors" by those to whom every detail of these pages, from their doughnut and pancake orgies to their tribal fear of cops, will uncover symptoms of bourgeois decadence never dreamed of in the complacent philosophy of the Mencken household.

"This," said Mr. Eliot lately of a piece of self-portraiture by Byron, "strikes me as a masterpiece of self-analysis, but of a self that is largely a deliberate fabrication—a fabrication that is only completed in the actual writing of the lines. The reason why Byron understood this self so well is that it is largely his own invention; and it is only the self that he invented that he understood perfectly." As much, for what it says for and against the methods of romantic self-regard, might be said of Mr. M. But all solemn issues aside, it must be impossible for anyone to read this immensely enjoyable book and not be grateful that here is at least one example of modern memory that is unburdened by dreary and boring efforts to extract the last drop of moral and deterministic juice from one's youthful fragments; one piece of autobiography in which neurotic portents are left for others to decide instead of being laid on in thick slabs of significance by the trowel of an uneasy vanity; one book of social history whose writing is as clear as water and a credit to the tradition of Mark Twain. It should remind us, against whatever doubts may persist about Mr. Mencken's reactionary excesses, his aesthetic crudities, or his philosophical light-handedness, that he remains one of the few authentic and creative historians of our national manners and folkways. From the early Baltimore *Sun* days down through "The Book of Prefaces," the books of "Prejudices," and the satirical heyday of the *American Mercury* to the latest edition of "The American Language," he has offset his crochets, blind spots, and obtuse literary loyalties by his instinctive feeling for vulgar health and realism, by his unmatched skill in nailing the oddities and idiocies of our folk mind and speech, by the humorous spirit he brought to journalism, by the healthy and evocative sympathies that now quicken the dimmest trivia of pre-war America and should quicken again the sadly enfeebled common sense of the present hour.

Mencken's eclipse in American cultural circles is a necessary preliminary to rediscovering his real place and office in twentieth-century life. When that fact reemerges, the lively validity of his best work will not only excuse the bluntness of his insights and the decided limitations of his judgment, but will reveal the fresh air he let in on our human and social relations, the relief he brought to our aesthetic and cultural suffocation, his honorable disgust, as Scott Fitzgerald recently recalled, "for what passed as criticism before he arrived and made his public," and "his bravery and his tremendous and profound love of letters." These services it is compulsory to remember, by a reviewer of differing loyalties no less than by "the jackals who are already tearing at what they imprudently regard as a moribund lion" and who cannot remember, with Fitzgerald's creditable justice, the attitude Mencken once brought "to any new effort by a new man."

Mencken's attitude toward new efforts and new men was unstable but it was his own; it was honest and vigorous; and however moribund he has allowed it to become in his public offices, it serves him here in the resurrection of his twelve first and angel years. One's immediate hope is that he will proceed to give us his next twelve, of adolescence and journalistic apprenticeship; and his next twelve, of *Sun* labors, political satire, and the Huneker era; and especially his next twelve, of bugbear-baiting and literary championing during one of the most colorful and demented prospecting periods in our history. One's second hope is that he will bring the same salt of sense and charm to leaven their gaseous pretensions. No one who ever shared even a small part of the heroic age of "Happy Days" will miss the beauty of his trophies, from the family rites of Christmas morning to the festivals of F. Knapp's Institute, from summer days on the Patapsco River to the discovery of "The Moose Hunters" in the *Chatterbox,* and from music lessons on the Stieff square at the hands of a roving damsel who mentioned "three sharps" or "five flats" but never a key, to the little girl with a piano solo at the school picnic who was "invariably drowned out by a freight train of the Pennsylvania Railroad, which ran only a few blocks away." They are impaled here infallibly on the pins of his wit, and their special honor is that they merit their place among the classic relics of American life, whose full context was displayed in "The American Language."

MORTON DAUWEN ZABEL

Portrait of Hitler

THE VOICE OF DESTRUCTION. By Hermann Rauschning. G. P. Putnam's Sons. $2.75.

THE author of "The Revolution of Nihilism" reports in his newest volume the conversations which he, as a high official of the Nazi Party and president of the Free City of Danzig, had with Hitler in the years from 1932 till 1935. He assures us that he "jotted them down under the immediate influence of what he had heard." But even if in the process of making Hitler's unprintable verbiage printable, not to speak of the difficulty of translating it into readable English, the emphasis may have been changed here or there, the report in no wise contradicts our knowledge of Hitler and his politics as it has come to us from other sources—Hitler's own writing, his public speeches, and most important of all his actions. Yet the author is mistaken when he states in his foreword that "only in exclusive circles is it known what Hitler really intends and what National Socialism is." He need only have read the German weeklies the *Tagebuch* and the *Weltbühne* during the years when he was an intimate of Hitler to realize that not everybody was fooled. Even before Hitler, with the help of the Rauschnings, came to power, Carl von Ossietzki, Leopold Schwarz-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

schild, Conrad Heiden, Rudolf Olden—to name only a few independent writers—without having the advantage of belonging to the exclusive circles of the Nazi Party, told who Hitler was and what his aims were and are. They told the truth in time and never believed for a second—as Herr Rauschning did—that the Communists had burned the Reichstag. He also seems to overestimate the news value of his recollections when he writes: "To have published these conversations only six months ago would have earned me at that time an accusation of malicious invention and defamation." Or is he thinking of the English and French Rauschnings who cherished at Munich and for some time afterward his own illusions of 1932?

The real value of "The Voice of Destruction" lies rather in the fact that its author is able to confirm as an insider, by means of a hundred characteristic and convincing details, what could be deduced before only from circumstantial evidence. And the report has another and very fascinating virtue: it gives the most vivid and most comprehensive character sketch yet drawn of Hitler. So plastic becomes his personality and so clear the workings of his mind that in reading this volume one often imagines oneself sitting opposite the Führer in the Berlin chancellery or behind the glass walls of the Berchtesgaden mountain retreat. One also learns to know more intimately such second-string Nazi leaders as Förster, Himmler, Röhm, or the bourgeois backers and allies of Hitler like Herr von Neurath. And one realizes Hitler's superiority in good and evil over all of them. In spite of the great tragedy under discussion one is often tempted to laugh aloud at the cunning advice Hitler gave to the perplexed president of the Danzig senate, who associated with pogromists and expected them to behave like law-abiding citizens.

Rauschning restates his theory of the Nazi movement as the revolution of "nihilism." Yet one feels this time even more strongly than before that he is describing, at best, surface phenomena. He calls National Socialism now the "St. Vitus's dance of the twentieth century." As descriptions of the hysterical aspects of Hitler and his politics such phrases may be accepted, but they are of little help if one attempts to diagnose the sickness which has shaken Europe, and not Europe alone, since the beginning of the twentieth century. It would not be necessary to stress this point in a review of a work which does not deal with the causes of Hitlerism but merely presents, and this with admirable skill, the personality and lack of principle of its leader if Rauschning's books did not tend to arouse escapists of all sorts to a frenzy about the desirability of morality instead of making them thoughtful about the forces which give scope to Hitler's, and for that matter Stalin's, immorality and transform it into forces from which the whole world suffers.

Herr Rauschning has come a long way since the day when he joined the Nazi Party. The shock of his disillusionment transformed him into a first-rank anti-Nazi. It also made him a first-rate writer. One looks forward with great expectations to his next work. It will show whether he is able to make a constructive step or whether he will again join the well-bred bankrupt conservatives who gave Hitler Germany and almost gave him Europe as well.

FRANZ HOELLERING

Business and Government

GOVERNMENT AND ECONOMIC LIFE. DEVELOPMENT AND CURRENT ISSUES OF AMERICAN PUBLIC POLICY. Volume I. By Leverett S. Lyon, Myron W. Watkins, and Victor Abramson. The Brookings Institution. $3.

ONE could wish there were some law compelling everyone who participates in the current fad of denouncing New Deal "interference" in business to read and assimilate this first volume of the Brookings Institution's comprehensive study of public policy with respect to economic life. The chances are that few of them will. Its 490 pages of closely packed analysis are not easy reading. Nor would their content be particularly agreeable to those whose minds are already made up on these fundamental issues. Yet it is an extraordinarily important and timely book And it is extraordinarily well done.

The volume traces the evolution of governmental policy toward our economic relationships from colonial times to the present day. It covers, successively, governmental procedures implementing private enterprise—those that affect business organization, bankruptcy, patent rights, and monetary policy—the regulation of private enterprise, and governmental policies toward labor. At the conclusion of each section the issues now on the frontier of public concern are thoroughly explored.

As might be suspected, the government's interest in economic affairs is by no means a new one. Certain established policies are traced back to our colonial period and from there to English common law. This is not to say that profound changes have not taken place in governmental policy since the founding of the Union. Changes of great significance are shown to have occurred, but few of them have emerged full-blown within the past six years. Most of them had their roots in the development of large-scale industry. Early American policy toward business is shown to have been almost completely dominated by the doctrines of individual enterprise then current. During the early nineteenth century it was strongly influenced by the popular idea that private enterprise was "natural" and therefore desirable, while government regulation was "artificial." This does not mean that the government was wholly passive with regard to business. On the contrary, it had a fairly vigorous program for implementing business and removing the obstacles to competition. And throughout the entire period there was some recognition of the fact that the community as a whole had certain interests which must be protected by the government. This responsibility became increasingly heavy as the impersonal corporation gained a dominant role in economic enterprise. Special consideration is given in this book to the as yet unsolved problems growing out of the separation of ownership and control in the modern corporation. It is recognized that the solution of these problems must inevitably lead to a further extension of government control over economic life.

A similar extension of governmental regulation is implied in the discussion of industrial combinations and the activities of trade associations. More striking, however, is the growing

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sense of public responsibility for the maintenance of "fair" standards of business behavior. Even in this field government activity is by no means new but is rooted in the common law which was taken over from England. The establishment of the Federal Trade Commission a quarter of a century ago has resulted, however, in the development of a brand-new philosophy of trade which is more applicable to modern conditions. Many of the commission's activities have been directed toward preventing the inaccurate branding of products, but not, in most cases, in order to protect the consumer. That is a field in which governmental regulation has scarcely begun. The commission's mandate has extended only to stopping misbranding which injured legitimate competitors. But there are indications that a social conscience is being developed which will demand regulation of a much more far-reaching and socially defensible character.

The section on labor policy is particularly penetrating and objective. Most earlier governmental activities are shown to have been, for obvious reasons, restrictive of organized labor. But in recent years there has been a growing disposition to recognize the legitimacy of certain basic labor rights. These have been defined and implemented, for the first time, in the Wagner Act. Efforts of employers to have that act amended to give them the same right to try to influence workers with respect to their union affiliations are shown to be directed against the underlying philosophy of the act, as, indeed, are most proposals to "equalize" the act. In its final two or three pages, the book touches upon an issue which is basic to the entire discussion. Justice Holmes is quoted as suggesting that the machine technique has made inevitable the trend toward increased governmental control of large-scale combinations; this truth would seem abundantly documented in the preceding pages of the book. Yet the implications of this important fact for the future are ignored. If the study is to have the influence it deserves, this omission should be remedied in the second volume.

MAXWELL S. STEWART

Cousin from Australia

BERNARD'S BRETHREN. By C. M. Shaw. Henry Holt and Company. $2.50.

IN THE most exciting plays there generally turns up near the end a cousin from Australia who in a few innocent words sets everybody right. In the life of George Bernard Shaw—which in many ways resembles a play—this incident has not failed to happen. Charles MacMahon Shaw, of Melbourne, Australia, has turned up, with a smile on his face and a manuscript under his arm. It is the manuscript, now printed as "Bernard's Brethren," that sets everybody right.

If you are in doubt about what the aboriginal Shaw was doing when the Life Force got under way, if you wish to know how real live Shaws sat for pen-portraits by Shakespeare, Sir Walter Scott, and W. S. Gilbert (O Captain Shaw), if it would amuse you to learn how many Shaws have been shot, hanged, and deported in the course of a long and honorable family history, with a few details on their finances and tastes in drinks, if, in short, you have been thinking all this while that G. B. S. was an original product of the nineteenth century—Shelley reincarnated and bent on making everybody drink water and eat chlorophyll—then read the cousin-from-Australia's book.

It is a beautifully got-up thing, with interleavings printed in red for George Bernard's comments on Cousin Charles's inaccuracies, perverted judgments, and occasional incoherence. Not that these foibles are characteristic of the Antipodean Shaw, or that the Dublin Ditto is hard on his cousin. Indeed, the statements and counter-statements provide an interesting comparison between the customary attitudes about trivial matters of a genius and a respectable citizen of more than average intelligence.

Once Cousin Charles has got over imagining that he is taking his life in his hands in writing the book, he becomes a fascinator in his own right and almost makes us wish for more. His chapter on Fanny Cashel Hoey—another literary connection of the Shaws—is a top-notch piece of exposition and literary criticism. And throughout the volume, when he lets himself go and doesn't refer to his "battered old typewriter"—a doubtful verbal asset which should be written off, since it certainly cannot be written on—he displays genuine Shavian wit. The quality is a rare one to find in such a tentacular genealogist. Which reminds me: where in all these illustrious kinsmen, including Marshal MacMahon, one time President of France, are Robert Gould Shaw of Civil War fame, the Mikado's Katishaw, and that most appealing of all figures, the Shaw of Persia?

JACQUES BARZUN

Shorter Notices

FINLAND. By J. Hampden Jackson. The Macmillan Company. $2.

This book is heartily recommended to those who suspect that the truth about Finland is to be found neither in uncritical eulogies of "a brave little people" nor in ferocious smears dictated in Moscow. For it is a study in black and white which tells the story of Finland's years of independence without slurring over the dark spots while giving due credit to the Finnish ability to shake off reaction and follow the paths of progress. In addition it provides a brief but useful sketch of the country's history prior to 1918 and an account of social conditions which helps us to understand why Finnish peasants and workers are looking Moscow's stalking horse, Mr. Kuusinnen, very sternly in the mouth. It should be made plain, perhaps, that this book was written, and published in England, in 1938 and has not been revised to include the events immediately preceding the present war.

PAGES FROM A WORKER'S LIFE. By William Z. Foster. International Publishers. $2.50.

A collection of stories from Foster's experience arranged under seven headings: work, sailing-ship days, hoboing, strikes, enemy agents, prison life, party life. Inferior as autobiography since the arrangement of material shows no relation between experience and either character or political development. Much magnificent short-story material frequently marred by poor story-telling. Fresh data on hobo techniques. A source book for Foster's future biographer. An injustice, as it stands, to one of America's greatest organizers.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

STALIN and HITLER

The Reasons for and the Results of THE NAZI-BOLSHEVIK PACT

a new 10c booklet by Louis Fischer

To thousands of liberal Americans, August 23, 1939, was the darkest moment of the post-war years. On that day Soviet Russia signed its pact with Nazi Germany. There were long hours of mingled disbelief and disappointment; then came the realization that an era of faith and hope had ended. What was the story behind the pact? What had happened inside Russia—and outside—to make the alliance possible? What did the event augur for the future of the Western world?

These are the questions that Louis Fischer weighs in this 64-page booklet. While a small part of this material has already appeared in *The Nation,* Mr. Fischer has added many fresh facts and more detailed documentation. Probably no contemporary journalist is better equipped to discuss the issues. Fischer covered Moscow for twelve years. In his dispatches to *The Nation* during that period—1924 to 1936—the observations of the keen reporter were presented with the perspective of the historian. By reason of Mr. Fischer's background and training, his analysis of the pact is not only exciting as journalism but important as history.

Give copies to your friends at these reduced prices—

Let us mail them for you without extra charge at the reduced prices for large quantities or at the single copy price. Send us *your* list —today!

Single copies.....10c each	250 copies or more....7c each
50 copies or more.....9c each	500 copies or more....6c each
100 copies or more....8c each	1,000 copies or more...5c each

ORDER FORM

THE NATION 55 Fifth Avenue New York City 3-2-40

I inclose $..... for ..... copies of Louis Fischer's booklet, "Stalin and Hitler."

☐ Send copies to the names on the list attached
OR
☐ Send copies to me.

Name.....

Address.....

.....

DRAMA

Could You and I Conspire

CLIFFORD ODETS'S "Night Music," performed at the Broadhurst by the Group Theater's excellent company, is not, I think, one of the best of its author's plays, but it is at least a lively and interesting production which ought to set at rest the fears of those who have been saying that Mr. Odets was growing conventional and conservative in method if not in philosophy. The new piece is fantastic, episodic, and explosive. It is also, despite bitter and protestant overtones, predominantly comic, and if taken in conjunction with two other recent plays might be signalized as part of still another "new movement." First-night wags were trying out phrases like "The Time of Mr. Odets's Life," and it is likely enough that I am not the first to suggest that another good title would be "Two Others on the Same Island." Nor are these mild jokes wholly inappropriate. It is not merely that the Messrs. Saroyan, Rice, and Odets have all abandoned realism for a sort of romantic extravaganza and that the two last have also abandoned realistic staging, but also that all three have adopted the same theme—namely, the triumph of youthful spirits over the confusions and cruelties of contemporary life. The differences—and they are surely considerable —are chiefly differences of temperament. Mr. Odets's angry defiance and his recurrent determination that his characters shall devote themselves to the task of doing something drastic about this sorry scheme of things are not the same as either Mr. Rice's amiable optimism or Mr. Saroyan's romantic primitivism, but all three come out at pretty much the same place. Boy meets girl, and, taking that fact into consideration, life is worth living after all. Perhaps it is also worth pointing out that all three feel the need for a *deus* to lend a hand with word and deed. Mr. Rice provides a hard-bitten man of the world who gives advice and pours champagne at the end. Mr. Saroyan, going the whole way as usual, introduces the mysterious Joe, who acts suspiciously like God himself. Mr. Odets gives us a kindly detective who follows the two innocents about and supplies whatever comments the hero himself is not able to give. For a taste of his quality one might cite the scene in which he squelches the protest of the heroine's father, who cannot understand why his daughter does not see that it is her duty to return with him to safety and Philadelphia. "The only function of parents," says the detective, "is to render themselves unnecessary."

"Night Music," to be more specific, deals with the fantastic and frequently farcical adventures of an unhappy young man sent from Hollywood to fetch two trained monkeys but held in New York over a week-end by events which are beyond his control but which he is desperately sure will cost him his job. He is a bumptious and self-pitying young man with, as one of the characters remarks, "the temper of a crocodile and only half its charm." But he is bumptious only because he is frightened and because he is reminded so frequently and so effectively that, bluster as he will, everyone knows that he is nobody and everyone knows that he

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

knows it. As a whole "Night Music" is centripetal; it explodes, often brilliantly, in all directions—perhaps it would not be inaccurate to say that it is in impulse lyrical rather than dramatic—but the character of this superficially unpleasant young man serves to bring it to some kind of focus, probably because he is plainly a kind of mouthpiece for the author's feelings if not for his thoughts. It is also this young man who finally articulates the theme. His girl makes some comment on the singing of the crickets. "Why shouldn't they sing," he says. "They've got nothing to worry about. But we can sing through any night."

It is hardly necessary any more to say that a production by the Group Theater is extremely well acted. Elia Kazan is well-nigh perfect as the bumptious young man and so is Morris Carnovsky as the detective. All the other parts are also very well played, including that of the heroine, undertaken by an actress new to the group, Jane Wyatt, who is attractive and appealing.

"Reunion in New York" (Little Theater) is the new entertainment provided by the group of exiles who last year gave a similar performance called "From Vienna." The company seems already more at home in both the American language and the American idiom, and there are three or four excellent satiric numbers as well as a general atmosphere of pleasant informality. Lotta Goslar's dances are always amusing. I should also single out the illustrated lecture on the kinds of laughter and the scene in the gallery of modern art.

JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH

MUSIC

READERS keep wanting to know whether the New York *Post* records were made by "the world's greatest orchestras and the world's greatest conductors," whether they are as good as the regular-priced records, whether they are good value for the *Post* price. With one exception, which I will speak of later, the records were made by the Philadelphia Orchestra under Ormandy and the New York Philharmonic under Reiner. Some of the performances, then, have greater precision and finish than others; and, as on more expensive records, the performances vary in interpretative understanding and effectiveness. Good are the Mozart, Schubert, Wagner, Debussy's "Fêtes," the first two movements of the Franck, the first three movements of the Tschaikovsky (if one excepts an occasional fussiness in phrasing); poor are the last movements of the Franck and Tschaikovsky, the Beethoven, the Brahms, the Bach; and the performances of Debussy's "Nuages" and "L'après-midi d'un faune," the most beautiful in tone, are in a lush style that I do not consider good.

The recording of all these performances is inferior to the best that can be done nowadays—this, I take it, being Victor's way of making value correspond to price (surfaces, however, are quiet). The Schubert and Beethoven recordings are clear without present-day brilliance; the Mozart, Bach, Wagner, Tschaikovsky, and Franck are brilliant without present-day refinement of sonority and balance; the Brahms

64 TO 1 You're right with LAFAYETTE'S Radio Line

Is it a portable? . . table model for office, den or "upstairs" . . . car radio . . . magnificent phono-combination? Lafayette has it. 64 distinct—and distinctive—models to choose from. All different in style and purpose, yet alike in this: dollar for dollar, Lafayette is finer in tone, superior in performance, greater in value than any other radio of your acquaintance. We invite you to visit our showroom nearest you for convincing proof of this statement. Or write for free catalog . You can spend more, but you cannot buy a better value than Lafayette.

LAFAYETTE RADIO
100 SIXTH AVENUE • NEW YORK, N. Y.
542 E. Fordham Rd. . . BRONX, N. Y. | 24 Central Ave. . . . . NEWARK, N. J.
90-08 166th Street . . . JAMAICA, L. I. | 110 Federal Street . . BOSTON, MASS.
901 W. Jackson Blvd. . CHICAGO, ILL. | 265 Peachtree Street . ATLANTA, GA.

THE LEAGUE FOR INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY
Invites you to a Dinner-Discussion
The Relationship of Power to Justice in a Socialized Society
Speaker: REINHOLD NIEBUHR
at the
PARKSIDE HOTEL, 18 Gramercy Park
Wednesday, MARCH 6 at 7 P. M.
Ticket: $1.10 *Make reservations in advance*
LEAGUE FOR INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY
112 East 19th Street New York City

Indispensable for a clear understanding of Nazi methods used to gain dominance over smaller states to the South, East and West of the Axis.

Prologue To War
by ELIZABETH WISKEMANN

Miss Wiskemann with her customary clarity and brilliance examines each country that has fallen prey to Pan-German aspirations. She first describes its general historical structure and then proceeds to analyze Nazi methods of penetration in both the racial and economic spheres from the Baltic to the Balkans and from Denmark to Switzerland.

The section on Switzerland is perhaps the clearest presentation we have had of the resistance of this multi-racial, and really democratic state to Nazi pressure. $3.00

At All Booksellers

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS, 114 Fifth Avenue, New York City

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Was Marx Wrong?

This week *The Nation* prints the last of three articles by Lewis Corey, called "Marxism Reconsidered." Mr. Corey not only finds the Marxist parties—both Communist and Socialist varieties—a failure, but he challenges some of the basic premises of Marx himself.

●

What do the Marxist leaders of America say?

Read Their Answers---

NORMAN THOMAS
for the Socialists

EARL BROWDER
for the Communists

MAX SHACHTMAN
for the Socialist Workers (Trotskyists)

BERTRAM D. WOLFE
for the Independent Labor League (Lovestoneites)

ALGERNON LEE
for the Social-Democratic Federation

All in next week's issue of

THE *Nation*

MAIL YOUR SUBSCRIPTION TODAY

THE NATION • 55 Fifth Avenue • New York
3-2-40

Special Introductory Offer to New Readers
13 Weeks for $1.

Regular Rates—1 Year $5 2 Years $8 3 Years $11

For the inclosed $..... please enter my *Nation* subscription for ..... (term).

Name.....

Address.....

Additional postage per year: Canadian, 50c; Foreign, $1

is excessively coarse in tone and unclear in texture; the Debussy has the refinement the others lack, but in "Fêtes" the muted trumpets at the beginning of the procession and at the very end of the piece were not recorded so as to sound magically distant as they do on Stokowski's record.

Haydn's Symphony No. 99 was recorded by the little orchestra of the New Friends of Music under Stiedry; and performance and recording make this one of the best sets in the *Post* series—which is not to say that it is the equal of the Columbia set with its finer recording of the more beautiful sound of the London Philharmonic and Beecham's phrasing.

Feuermann is a greater 'cellist than the member of the Busch-Serkin Trio whom he was called in to substitute for at a recent New Friends of Music concert; but two members of a group like the Busch-Serkin Trio playing with a stranger do not exhibit the ease and freedom and incandescent ensemble execution born of the mutual understanding, the unanimity of feeling and purpose which the three members of the Trio have from years of playing together. In this situation Messrs. Busch, Serkin, and Feuermann fell back on vigor, with which they were able to cover up defects of ensemble performance in Beethoven's Trio Opus 70 No. 1 but not in Mozart's Trio K. 548; and I don't recall hearing from a pianist of Serkin's eminence anything as heavy-handed, graceless, and insensitive as his phrasing of the Mozart slow movement. He did better playing in Mozart's Concerto K. 271 with the National Orchestral Association, but playing which did not have the sharpness, sparkle, and wit of Gieseking's in the Columbia recording, and which made it clear that Serkin is a pianist who cannot do for music in the classical style what he can do for Brahms.

For its first public concert of its own the Primrose Quartet chose a curious program of unfamiliar and inferior music: Haydn's "Seven Last Words of Christ" and Smetana's Quartet in E minor. It turned out that the Haydn, largely for solo violin with string accompaniment, exhibited the beautiful playing and phrasing of the group's first violin, Oscar Shumsky, while the Smetana provided solo passages in which one heard some rasping sounds from William Primrose's viola and some fine playing by the 'cellist, Harvey Schapiro. Also, the Haydn exhibited at length the group's beautifully blended and inflected tone in *piano* and *pianissimo;* but above *forte* the tone became rough and lusterless and sometimes departed from pitch.

As for Milstein's recital, he is a virtuoso, but as such he is unusual in possessing the good musical instincts which enabled him to give an excellent performance of the Vivaldi sonata and a good one—even if not the one a great artist would have given—of the Bach Chaconne, but which did not prevent him from tearing through the Beethoven sonata.

B. H. HAGGIN

[We regret that through an unfortunate error *The Nation* carried in its last issue notices of two books which are not yet available. Susan Glaspell's "The Morning Is Near Us" will be published on March 20; "Aretino: Scourge of Princes," by Thomas Caldecot Chubb, on March 8.—EDITORS THE NATION.]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Letters to the Editors

Refugee Enterprises

Dear Sirs: Many of the compassionate friends of the European refugees in this country urge them to leave the overcrowded cities and seek the small towns, where they will have a better chance to start a new life. But Robert Lynd, the author of "Middletown," surely a competent adviser in this matter, foresees that immigrants coming from an intellectualized and complicated environment might encounter difficulties in the adjustment to a more primitive milieu. For this reason, if for no other, no enforced placement of the refugees, such as was suggested by a prominent immigrant to this country some time ago, can be considered a desirable solution.

Other reasons are found, however, in the financial status of the refugees now entering this country. Whereas until two years ago many of the emigrants were well to do and were allowed to take with them at least part of their property, there is now a stampede of people running for their naked lives. This second wave of immigrants, comprising Jews from Vienna, Czechoslovakia, and Poland, is a problem for the resettlement program because neither the few who have a little capital of their own nor the many who have nothing but business initiative or specific technical knowledge can solve their very great difficulties by their own strength alone.

Erich Warburg, a member of the internationally known family of bankers, now a leading spirit in the field of refugee service, has recently pointed to the opportunities offered to the immigrant by small business and small industry. However, very definite opportunities have to be found, and when found have to be investigated and appraised. Many of the immigrants who have a little money are so aware of their ignorance of the conditions and technique of business in this country that they vacillate between the fear of losing their last reserves by bad investments and the dread of having to eat them up. The rash ones often lose their capital very quickly. Those who possess nothing except business initiative or some special skill struggle, mostly in vain, to obtain financial assistanc These are the ones that form the lo queues in the offices of various refu organizations, filling out endless qu tionnaires.

One or two small endowments h as their special purpose financial ass ance to immigrants in the way of ca talization of small enterprises. M more is needed—above all, a planned, constructive policy base sufficient loan funds and carried c a business organization with t operation of refugee organizatio public authorities. In England tw ago the government established i nection with the Board of Trade reau with the task of examini various refugee proposals for n terprises. Under the auspices bureau, aided by the local auth many plants in the so-called tressed areas" were reopened f manufacture of specialties, so which had heretofore had to l ported. Several hundred ente most of them quite new to En have been established, and mor 15,000 British workers, reputedl than the total number of perman migrants admitted to England, found employment. In the Unite the establishment of new busin terprises is not a matter of gove control, but a more fertile coop with local banks and credit or tions could surely be establishe business organization having as program the directing and finan resettlement.

The ideal form for such an organization would be an endowed foundation. The experience of institutions with similar purposes may encourage social-minded capitalists. If properly managed, such foundations are not only able to preserve their capital in a revolving investment cycle but even to increase it. Many of the Polish refugees could give reports of what had been accomplished in the way of agricultural resettlement in former Austrian Poland with the help of the Baron de Hirsch Foundation. To preserve their capital, to see it used in a way that would be a blessing for thousands of now distressed but worthy individuals, to take the lead in a field of activity which is of greatest importance in the life of the nation —might that not be a most attractive goal for owners of "idle money"?

VICTOR HELLER

Forest Hills, N. Y., February 21

Imperfect Alternatives

Dear Sirs: I wish to congratulate you on the article by Reinhold Niebuhr that was printed in *The Nation* of January 20. Mr. Niebuhr's argument that in the United States today we do not have the privilege of choosing between ideal international policies but must choose among imperfect alternatives is a view that, elementary as it is, needs somehow to be got into the consciousness of Americans and especially into the consciousness of American liberals. No better commentary on our present confused state of mind could be made than that clarification of this point at the present time is of basic importance.

I wish to carry Mr. Niebuhr's argument a little farther. In my opinion, there is no possibility that this country can follow indefinitely a policy of isolation. We must consider what our situation will be if Germany and Russia, one or the other or both, emerge victorious from the present conflict. Will this country be able to maintain peaceful relations with a Nazi or Communist or Nazi-Communist Europe? More particularly, have American liberals come to the point where they are in favor of a peaceful policy toward nations which exemplify everything that has been abhorrent to liberals in the past?

I, for one, am convinced that in the present European conflict we must sooner or later choose one side or the other. Though the governments and economies of France, England, and Finland are perhaps not the best possible, yet they are so much better than the ones to which they stand opposed, they are so much more in accord with our own, that we shall sooner or later support them rather than see them fall.

At present, France, England, and Finland do not need our men. If we supply them with all the armaments, munitions, and supplies that they need, they can almost certainly win the war. Nothing could be more shortsighted and contemptible than our present policy of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

requiring payment in cash. What will be the value of this gold when we have it all in vaults in this country? Whatever our interest in the present European struggle, one thing is certain: this interest cannot be measured by gold. If we do not send supplies and furnish credits so that these may be secured as needed, Russia by sheer weight of numbers will overrun Finland and within the next year or two France and England may be faced with the prospect of defeat. When this situation develops, it is very likely that we shall become seriously concerned, and then armaments, munitions, and supplies will not be enough. Then we shall have to send men as well.

There probably is not much time left to make choices calmly, to shape policies carefully, to achieve by positive, intelligent action the ends that the overwhelming majority of the country certainly desires—namely, defeat of Hitler and Stalin and peace with the least loss in the shortest time. If this country does not adopt the policy here suggested, which admittedly is not an ideal one, it may later be faced with the necessity of following a course which will be far worse. W. T. COUCH

Chapel Hill, N. C., February 19

"Cultural" Intimacies

Dear Sirs: Archibald MacLeish, in donning the mantle of prophet (The Art of the Good Neighbor in *The Nation* of February 10) apparently has allowed the urgency of his message to overbalance his sense of logic.

He suggests that North America must fear the development of closer "cultural relations" between Nazi Germany and the nations of the southern continent more than an economic struggle for markets. Yet he admits that thus far the cultural intimacy of South America with Western Europe has been largely with Paris. And, further, he himself stresses the influence of the "small and sophisticated and discriminating jury of critics and artists and professional scholars" in Latin America. Again, obviously, the culture of Paris and the culture of the United States are from the point of view of Western democracy, closely allied.

These are, we believe, the basic premises in Mr. MacLeish's argument. But what happens to this argument under analysis? If South America refuses to accept in any great measure our American culture, will it not, on one hand, still be under the influence of Paris and consequently averse to that of Germany and other totalitarian lands? And, on the other hand, will not the sensitivity and intelligence of our Latin neighbors enable them to perceive the emptiness of Nazi culture as compared with the culture of Paris and with democratic culture in general? Thus, using Mr. MacLeish's own premises, one must conclude that the danger for Western democratic culture is not so great. If Mr. MacLeish believes, as we do, that there *is* a danger, he must demonstrate it upon other grounds.

We do not attempt to deny the validity of Mr. MacLeish's contention that it is necessary to persuade Latin America that Hollywood and the tabloids do not represent the total of North American culture. But while persuading and prophesying it might not be amiss to develop the argument more stringently; possibly the road to better "cultural relations" might thereby be smoothed. HARRY W. BASEHART
SEYMOUR RIKLIN

Chicago, February 22

And Still They Come

Dear Sirs: Congratulations and greetings on the occasion of the seventy-fifth anniversary of *The Nation*. In critical examination of current events, in studied analysis of social thought, and action, *The Nation* stands preeminently as the most consistent, objective, and liberal magazine in the world today.

It has treated the acute problems of the Negro people with a generosity and earnestness that should be exemplary to other so-called liberal publications. It represents the most vital force, and perhaps the only redeeming feature, in our democracy.

Chicago METZ T. P. LOCHARD

Dear Sirs: As a frequent contributor to *The Nation* in its older management, and in appreciation of Mr. Villard and the tradition he represents in the present continuity, I send greetings and good wishes on the occasion of the anniversary. JOSEPH JASTROW

Stockbridge, Mass.

Dear Sirs: Somewhat belatedly I should like to add my word of congratulation on *The Nation's* seventy-fifth anniversary.

I cannot remember just when my reading of *The Nation* began. I am under the impression that it was in Canada some years before I came to this country on New Year's Day, 1919, with the intention of becoming an American citizen. I do know that during the eighteen years of my editorship here in Boston, first of the *Congregationalist* and then of its successor, the *Advance*, *The Nation* has been a constant medium of information and reference.

The Nation would not be the free-minded organ of inquiry and discussion that it is if one did not find oneself frequently at variance with some expression in its editorial or contributed columns. But one always looks to it for honesty of judgment and integrity of record, according to the writer's viewpoint. A paper managed and edited upon that basis will always be a source of inspiration and encouragement to journalists, either in the secular or in the religious field, who are endeavoring to carry on their work with that same high ideal in mind.

Boston WILLIAM GILROY

CONTRIBUTORS

ALLAN A. MICHIE is coauthor of a recently published book called "Dixie Demagogues."

ERNEST DAVIES is a British writer who has long been associated with the Labor Party. Last year he was adopted as labor candidate for Enfield.

LEWIS COREY is the author of "The Decline of American Capitalism," "The House of Morgan," and "The Crisis of the Middle Class."

MORTON DAUWEN ZABEL is the editor of an anthology of "Literary Opinion in America."

FRANZ HOELLERING was formerly editor of the *Arbeiter Illustrierte Zeitung*, and on the editorial staff of the Ullstein publications. He is now living in this country.

JACQUES BARZUN, assistant professor of history at Columbia University, is the author of "Culture in the Democracy" and "Of Human Freedom."

INFORMATION FOR SUBSCRIBERS

THE NATION, 55 Fifth Ave., New York. Price, 15 cents a copy. By subscription—Domestic: One year $5; Two years $8; Three years $11. Additional Postage per year; Foreign, $1; Canadian, 50 cents. The Nation is indexed in Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature, Book Review Digest, Dramatic Index, Index to Labor Periodicals, Public Affairs Information Service. Two weeks' notice and the old address as well as the new are required for change of address.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED